

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH NO. 3

Review of a Case-History suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory

PRABHU—Report of the case suggestive of
Extra Cerebral Memory

By

H.N. BANERJEE

DIRECTOR

P.K. MATHUR

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE

S.C. MUKHERJEE

RESEARCH SECRETARY

DEPARTMENT OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RAJASTHAN

JAIPUR



DEPARTMENT OF PARAPSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF RAJASTHAN

JAIPUR, INDIA

Review of a Case-History suggestive of
Extra Cerebral Memory

PRABHU—*Report of the case suggestive of
Extra Cerebral Memory*

•

This report may not be reproduced
by any means, in whole or in part,
without the permission of the authors
and the publishers, except for the
quotation of brief passages in references.

•

Paper back Edition Price	Rs 12 00	Hard Bound Edition Price	Rs 15 00
"	" Sh 18	"	" Sh 23
"	" \$ 2 50	"	" \$ 3 50

For subscribers of the Journal of the Department Half Price

•

Published by the Department of Parapsychology University of Rajasthan, Jaipur,
India and printed by P. C. Bhargava, Manager, Rajasthan University Press,
University of Rajasthan, Jaipur, India, on Tuesday, the 15th June, 1965

P R E A M B L E
TO
THE STUDY OF THE CASE

The present case has been re-investigated with a view to placing facts before the reader as they are, without prejudice or prepossession of any kind on the part of the investigators.

The term Extra Cerebral Memory (ECM) has been used as a working term with a demarcating function without having identifiable ontological counterpart in order to describe cases popularly known as cases of reincarnation

The claims of memories of previous life by the Subject appear to be independent of cerebrum which is supposed to be the main repository of memory, and the cerebrum of the person with which the memories are associated, is destroyed with the death of the person. The term 'reincarnation' is presumptuous and has spiritualistic and occultic connotations while the present investigation has been conducted as an empirical scientific study leaving aside theoretical considerations, for or against.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors of the present report are grateful to the members of the Advisory Committee with whose concurrence this report has been published. The Advisory Committee has been appointed by the University of Rajasthan with the purpose of making suggestions and critically evaluating the research programmes of the Department of Parapsychology. Every research report prepared by the Department is first scrutinized by the Advisory Committee and then in the light of the suggestions made by the Committee, the report is modified and published with its concurrence. H N Bonerjee, Director, Department of Parapsychology, is the Member-Secretary of this Committee.

The authors express their sense of gratitude to the members of the Advisory Committee for their valuable guidance in their research programmes from time to time. The Committee consists of the following Heads of Departments of the University —

- 1 Dr Daya Krishna —Head of the Department of Philosophy—Convener
- 2 Dr G C Pandey —Inogue Professor of Indian Culture & Head of the Department of History and Indian Culture—Member.
- 3 Dr G C Patni —Head of the Department of Mathematics—Member.
- 4 Dr T K N Unnathan —Head of the Department of Sociology—Member
- 5 Dr. B D. Tikkiwal —Head of the Department of Statistics—Member.

CONTENTS

<i>S. No</i>		<i>Page.</i>
1.	Preface . . .	5
2	Introduction . . .	8
3	Summary of the case . . .	18
4	Story of the case as based on evidence about which there is complete conformity of statements . . .	25
5.	Procedure of Interview . . .	27
6	Story of the Investigation .	35
7.	Relevant Facts of Geography ...	38
8	Testimony of Ganga Gurus .	40
9	Comparative Chart ...	43
10	Review of the Report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal ...	49
11	Discrepancies . . .	59
12.	Summary of Recognitions ...	65
13	Recalls .	71
14	Behaviour .	79
15	Emotions .	80
16.	Discussion .	81
17.	Appendix I . . .	90
18.	Appendix II ...	124
19	Appendix III ..	131
20.	Appendix IV .	136
21	Appendix V ..	139
22.	Index of Relevant Particulars ...	144

ABBREVIATIONS

S—Subject, I—Index, IP—Identified Person; ECM—Extra Cerebral Memory, ST—Statement, W—Witness, P.W.—Primary Witness, S, W —Secondary Witness.

Dedicated to

Dr. M. S. MEHTA,
VICE-CHANCELLOR

—the pioneer in encouraging
Parapsychological Researches
at the University level.

PREFACE

One of the exploratory methods in general use in Parapsychology is the method of re-examination according to which old data are re-examined for other purposes than the original investigators had in mind. The investigator in need of answers to certain questions, turns towards whatever relevant available data he can find. This method is, therefore, more or less a search among old records for overlooked significance. This is why the study of the present case was taken up again by us.

People supporting the hypothesis of reincarnation and those criticising it, base their respective comments on the present available evidence pertaining to such alleged cases. In their defence or protest they generally cite cases like the one of Shanti Devi. The case of Prabhū is also often referred to by them in their discussion. But they hardly take pains to probe into the very question of the evidence itself. What type of evidence is in reality available even when one makes one's best efforts to investigate the case as thoroughly as can be possible? Their hasty conclusions do not justify their stand. To point out the type of evidence and other data available when one tries to study the alleged cases of Extra Cerebral Memory, the case of Prabhū is being presented here. The case of Shanti Devi will thus also be reported afresh in near future.

Evidences are not so coercive as to lead one to form a definite opinion about a particular case in either rejecting or accepting it. A stringent method or an adequate process is still to be evolved to collect first hand evidence so as to exclude the possibility of other alternative hypotheses.

The evidence for or against a case may either be spontaneous or experimental. The alleged cases of Extra Cerebral Memory cannot be subjected to the experimental evidence. One has, therefore, to rely on the circumstantial evidence of the case.

and the circumstantial evidence can at best be collected if the research methods applicable to the social sciences, are properly and judiciously followed. Hence the investigation of such cases involves great many difficulties on the part of the investigator.

The other alternative hypotheses of Extra Sensory Perception (ESP), Incorporal Personal Agency (IPA), Psychometry or the like, will also be examined separately in which case twenty subjects claiming to remember their previous lives, will be selected and then subjected to experimental tests under controlled conditions. From their cumulative data, each of these hypotheses will be thoroughly examined.

The investigation of this case was formerly assigned by Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur to the charge of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal, C I E, in the year 1922 who carried out the investigation in 1923. His findings were published in a Hindi Magazine 'Kalpala' and in the July-August, No 4 issue of the French periodical "Revue Metapsychique".

The main events of this case occurred about forty four years ago. Although this distance in time makes this case somewhat difficult to re-evaluate at present, other reasons justify our presenting a summary and analysis of the same. First, we think it deserves to be added to the list of rather well authenticated cases suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory. Written accounts were made of Prabhu's statements prior to the attempt at verification and the investigation was carried out by persons outside the immediate family of the child. This is a vital point in the investigation of such cases. Secondly, since some critics of this study have suggested that (except for themselves) the whole of India has surrendered to an uncritical acceptance of Extra Cerebral Memory, we think it important to draw attention to the empirical attitude which has existed towards this subject in India for many years. Hence the case is important from historical point of view as well. The investigation of this case by Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, has been described by Dr G Geley, Editor, "*Revue Metapsychique*" (1924) as having been conducted "with a completely scientific bent of mind".

Our extensive inquiries about Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal have revealed that he was the President of the "Memory of Past Life Research Association", the object of which was to "investigate reported cases of memory of Previous Birth and let the public know the bare facts as they come to light in inquiry" "It is intended", so goes the memorandum, issued by Shri Ram Gopal Mishra, Secretary of the Association, "that the cases that the Association should in future publish after its inquiry be based on no less reliable evidence than what a High Court requires to sentence a man to death". Thirdly, we could interview some primary witnesses to the case and could collect additional data which throw light on the general characteristics of the case. The information on the general characteristics is needed for conceiving an integrated theory of the problem of Extra Cerebral Memory. Before that can be done many cases will have to be studied.

H N B.

P K. M

S C. M.

*Department of Parapsychology,
University of Rajasthan,
Jaipur*

INTRODUCTION

When any case suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory is reported, the readers react to it in different ways. There are some who simply neglect the case, others talk of it and say that it is a supernatural phenomenon which the human mind is incapable of understanding. There are still others who reject the case on the ground that it has been fabricated. With such a diversified opinion of the people in general about the alleged cases of reincarnation, one cannot but think that there should be an impartial study of the cases on scientific lines so that truth may be revealed.

The investigators of the present case, therefore, feel that such cases should be studied without prejudice or prepossession of any kind and in a scientific manner too. The aim of the present study has been pointed out in the Preamble to the case. In order to study the case impartially it is necessary to examine the three possible hypotheses* that can be framed in the investigation of the case and can be examined according to circumstantial evidential method of study followed here. The way in which the case is put to test is of paramount importance. Needless to say that the earlier investigators, with certain reservations, did not aim their investigations to make a scientific approach to this problem. Three broad hypotheses are examined minutely to test the case. They are —

- 1 The case is one of fabrication
- 2 There have been normal sources of information in the case
- 3 The case is suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory

* There are other possible hypotheses as well, as for example—the case may be one of telepathy, clairvoyance, Incorporeal Personal Agency (mediumistic phenomenon), Psychometry or the like, but here we shall restrict our study to the examination of only three hypotheses as mentioned above.

At the very outset one may raise an issue that the case may be one of fabrication. Whether the case has been concocted can be examined from different angles. It can be seen whether there has been publicity motive of the party. The charge of having the publicity motive can be examined on the basis of the circumstances in which the events developed. Again, there may be motive for monetary gain. In this connection, the reputation of the parties in their community, their economic condition and such other aspects as may be helpful in finding out this motive, should be enquired into. Then it should also be enquired from the witnesses whether the party is in the habit of fabricating such stories or distorting facts.

In this way, when the possibility of the first hypothesis is found not to be there, the next hypothesis should be taken up.

It may be possible that the case might have sprung up as a result of possible normal sources of getting information. The distance between the two places namely, the house of the Subject and that of the Identified Person may be too short and the route may be simple instead of being circuitous and confusing. So also may be the possibility of having any exchange of relation or any other exchange between the two parties. Again, it may also be possible that the particulars about the death of the Identified Person might have been known to many persons of the village or locality in which the Subject lives or the news of the death of the Identified Person might have been published in any newspaper through which the family of the Subject might have got a chance to construct a story. Thus the points, such as distance between the two places, route, exchange between the parties concerned and other relevant factors should be taken into consideration and then the investigator should arrive at a conclusion whether there has been the possibility of normal sources of getting information in the case.

When both the above mentioned hypotheses are ruled out, the third hypothesis, namely, whether the case is suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory, should be taken up. While examining this hypothesis, all those points in the case which point to the para-

normal source of information on the part of the Subject, should be examined. The recalls and recognitions, if they have been proper, add to the strength of the case and if the emotional reactions and the behavioural patterns of the subject are most appropriate to those of the Identified Person, that too makes the case suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory. In our investigation of the case reported herein, all these factors have been taken into consideration and then on the basis of the testimony of the witnesses certain probable conclusions have been arrived at. Examples from the case under report to substantiate all these three hypotheses have not been discussed in their proper context of the case.

The cases of Extra Cerebral Memory have been reported from different corners of the world from time to time. The reference to the theory of rebirth can be traced as far back as the Vedas and the Upanishads. The Indian philosophical systems, though not all, also speak of this problem. On spiritual and speculative level there has been much discussion on this problem of rebirth but any serious attempt at scientific study of this problem was not known till quite recently. The cases of rebirth reported from different places were studied, if at all, in a haphazard manner without following the scientific procedure. It is to be noted that the history of such cases follows almost a conventional pattern. The case usually starts when a small child between two and four years begins telling his parents or siblings of a life he led in another time or place. The child frequently importunes his parents to let him return to the community where he had formerly lived. If the child makes enough particular statements of the previous life, the parents (usually reluctantly) begin inquiries about the accuracy of the statements of the child. If some verification results members of the two families visit each other and they ask the child to recognise places, objects and people associated with his supposed previous existence. This is the usual pattern of investigation that was followed by lay investigators.

Now in this type of study many details about the case were ignored which are of vital importance to the proper study of the case. The method of study of such cases has undergone

considerable change. It is not done in a haphazard way now as was done in the past. A Manual for studying cases of Extra Cerebral Memory has been prepared by our Department which gives in detail the procedure that has to be followed for studying such cases thoroughly and to elicit necessary information for arriving at a certain conclusion about the case.

There are many important points of study which were formerly omitted by persons who undertook the investigation of such cases. Let us now consider all those points in detail. The report of the present case has been prepared keeping in view these basic points of information about the case.

The point about the status of the witness, who comes forward to testify the utterances of the child and the events that occurred in his presence, was not observed previously. The social position of the witness counts much in the reliability of his statements. Then his relation with the Subject is also an important point to note. If the witness is related to the Subject his statement may be coloured by his preconceived ideas which he might have been having about the story of the case and if he is not related to him, his statements may have impartiality. If he is to give any false statement about the case, after all, what for? Hence it is essential to note the relation of the witness to the Subject. The more he is independent and unrelated, the more there is likelihood of his testimony to be reliable and correct. A person is less tempted to conceal the truth about persons with whom he is not related for he has nothing to gain or lose by stating the fact.

The dates of the death of the Identified Person and the birth of the Subject were generally not noted by the previous investigators. This is a vital point to note as the intervening period between the death of the Identified Person and the birth of the Subject is very much important for an investigator of the case with regard to certain other relevant data¹. In the present case

1 In his *Review* of the first two Research Monographs—'Ismail' and 'Munesh' published by our Department, Dr. Daya Krishna, Prof. and Head of the Department of Philosophy, University of Rajasthan, India also stressed the point that every

attempts have been made to find out the same but only partial success could be achieved. Prabhu's horoscope, as mentioned in the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal, reveals that he was born on the night of Masi Sudi 2, Samvat 1957 (corresponding to the English date--Sunday, 2nd February, 1919) but the date of the death of Hurbux was not intimated by any witness nor is there any entry to this effect in the old record of the case. However, there is a note by Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal in his report which gives an idea of the approximate year of the death of Hurbux. On verification of item No. 1 of the statement of Prabhu, he found that "a man called Hurbux had lived at Hathori and had died five years earlier." The case was investigated under his supervision in the year 1923. This shows that according to the above remark Hurbux had died in the year 1918.

The investigators particularly noted that the villagers seldom maintain the records of the dates of birth of their children. When asked for they look unawares and point to some child who happens to stand near them to indicate the age of their child or they would refer to some events that might have happened on the day the child was born or to some tree or any other object to clarify their point which is obviously of no importance to the investigator.

The age of the Identified Person at the time of his death was generally not noted by the previous investigators. Now while noting down other details about the case, we try to find out from the witness the exact date of the death of the Identified Person. It has often been observed that like the date of birth of the Subject the villagers do not remember the date of the death of the Identified Person nor do they have any written record of the same. In absence of this information the investigator is faced with much difficulty. Effort is being made to evolve a method of determining the date

effort should be made to find out the dates of the death of the Identified Person and the birth of the Subject in order to determine the intervening period. Hence in our present study we tried our utmost to find out the required dates.

of birth of the Subject and the death of the Identified Person in the absence of written testimony on these points, In the case under report, the '*Ganga Gurus*' and the Jagas who maintain the records of the dates of death and of birth respectively, were also contacted for the purpose.

Next comes the question of exchange between the two families. Previously, this important point was either ignored altogether or lightly dismissed. No one seriously bothered whether the two families—that of the Subject and of the Identified Person—ever came into contact with each other, whether there was any sort of exchange between them, whether there were normal sources of information in the case and whether there was direct or indirect relationship between the two families. In a proper investigation of the case, the investigator cannot ignore this vital issue. We try to find out in every possible manner whether there was any direct or indirect exchange between the parties involved in the case.

Again, the question of the length of time elapsed between the main events of the case and the interview with the witnesses is also significant. This length of time indicates how fresh the case is. If the witness can easily recall what had happened. There is also a particular set of questions in the questionnaire designed to elicit from the witness the information about the Subject, his knowledge about the Subject is thus recorded. Proper psychological method of study should be applied in the study of such cases. Much depends upon the investigator whose handling of the situation and the witness psychologically count a great deal in determining the truth of the story. The witness should be interviewed individually and not in the group. This significant point was also not observed in the past. We now interview the witnesses individually in a cordial and friendly atmosphere so that they might give facts of the case without feeling any sort of inhibition. Psychological technique is used for creating empathy among the witnesses.

We also note as to what impression does the witness give of clarity in his memories—whether he recalls details of the

case easily, vividly or vaguely His attitude towards ESP and the problem of survival is also noted

This is because most of the Indian people believe that the cases of reincarnation occur in India because of their deep rooted faith and belief in this phenomenon Because of their pre-conceived notion towards the theory of rebirth they treat every such case to be one of reincarnation. This uncritical acceptance of the theory of rebirth by the people of India is mainly responsible for the neglect of the attitude towards investigation of the cases of rebirth from a critical and scientific point of view

It is essential to find the circumstantial evidence of the case because by doing so the real cause of the development of the case can be known Such information as, for example, the age of the Subject at first recall of memories, circumstances leading to recall, the manner in which the news of the case spread outside the family circle, the method of verification of statement of the Subject adopted, whether verification was attempted by mail or in person, and whether the claims of the Subject were written down before verification was attempted (*which is done in order to prevent modifications of the statement to suit the evidence*) is of paramount importance in the proper investigation of a case Such factors as these were either not known to the persons who were interested in the study of such cases or were not heeded to We take into consideration all these points while conducting investigation.

The crux of all that has been said above is to see whether all the possible normal sources of information (which may have given rise to the claims of the subject) in the case have been eliminated completely and for this purpose various types of questions and interview techniques have been set to elicit information in this regard

The collection of psychological data is equally necessary Whether the particular psychological traits in the subject really correspond with the traits which the Identified Person possessed or not, is observed. Formerly, it was not so much cared for.

If the particular traits, emotions and behaviour of the Subject resemble the traits, emotions and behaviour of the Identified Person, the case becomes strong. Hence the collection of psychological data plays a very important role in determining the strength of the case.

Equally important is the collection of Parapsychological data. Previously, no attention was paid to elicit information about the Subject's capacity to know incidents occurring at a distance without the use of normal senses, his capacity to know the thoughts occurring in other minds and to know incidents taking place in future. These data also help the investigator to understand whether the case of ECM (Extra Cerebral Memory) can be explained as the case of ESP (Extra Sensory Perception).

The parapsychologists who are critical of the study of ECM think that almost all evidences for reincarnation can be explained by the hypothesis of ESP or IPA (Incorporeal Personal Agency). Accordingly, they are of the view that the Subjects of such cases acquire information about the lives of the Identified Persons clairvoyantly, which are claimed by them as their own memory traces and are presented in dramatised form. The way to ascertain the validity of the hypothesis is to administer clairvoyance test to the ECM subjects.¹

1 Dr H N Banerjee, in his article "Experimental design for clairvoyance test for ECM subjects", published in "PARAPSYCHOLOGY"—the Indian Journal of Parapsychological Research, Vol IV No 4, has laid down a procedure for the test to be used by the investigators to verify the clairvoyant capacity of the subject.

For eliminating the hypothesis of IPA or mediumship, the adopted form of Pratt and Roll may be administered to the subjects (See Pratt J G and Birge, W R "Appraising Verbal Test Material in Parapsychology"—*J of Parapsychology* 1948, 12, 136-56, Carington, W. The quantitative study of trance personalities *Proc Soc Psych Res*, 1933-34 42, 173-240, 1935, 43, 319 61, 1936-37, 44, 189-222, see also 1936-37, 44, 276-77 and Roll W G "The Contribution of Studies of 'Mediumship' to Research on Survival After Death"—*J —Parapsychology*, 1960, December, 258-278).

If the ECM Subject scores high in the test for clairvoyance, the hypothesis that the particular ECM Subject has acquired information about the life of the Identified Person clairvoyantly, will get strength, otherwise not. Similarly, if the Subject does not do well in Pratt and Roll tests, he cannot be considered a Subject of IPA and this hypothesis cannot be used for explaining his capacities.

Then comes the point of recognition.² The main test and the most important one is the recognition test in such cases. Much depends upon how the recognition tests are given to the Subject. If the recognition tests are defective, the case may not show its potentialities and it has been observed in most of the cases which were investigated formerly by different investigators that recognition tests were not properly administered to the Subject. There remains the possibility of guidance and suggestion to the Subject by the bystanders which renders the case weak. Now in our study of such cases, we are alive to this problem. How and in what manner were the recognitions of certain items attempted, is a vital point in the case. It is just possible that due to some leading questions suggestive of answers, the Subject might have recognised persons and other items. "Is this your house?" "Is she your mother?", are the leading questions which may prompt the Subject to say 'Yes' and then it is inferred that the Subject has recognised his or her house or mother as the case may be. This type of recognition test is defective. The investigation of the present case shows that the recognition tests were not properly administered. In our study of such cases we are very careful about this problem. It is to be seen how and in what manner recognition of certain items were made by the Subject. He might not have any clue to the item before hand, before whom recognition took place, who approved the recognition, are important points to be noted. We incorporate all these points in our discussion of the case and see whether recognitions were properly made.

² 'A Model For Recognition Tests For ECM Subject'—Manual For Studying Cases of Extra Cerebral Memory (ECM) By Dr H N Banerjee

Recalls of the subject Should also be noted carefully. The point to be observed is whether the recalls of the Subject are spontaneous or some cues have been given. Spontaneous vivid recalls by the Subject of the details of his previous life add to the strength of the case and makes it more authentic. Thus the case becomes more important. Importance of the case increases if the Subject gives details about the Identified Person not known outside his family circle or items which cannot be known normally.

If emotional reactions and behavioural patterns of the subject greatly resemble or are akin to those of the Identified Person, as has been pointed out earlier, that too adds to the significance of the case. This important factor was altogether neglected by persons who investigated such cases previously. In our investigation, we note these important factors as well.

Another important thing to note in the investigation of such cases is to see whether the statements of the subject were recorded before verification of the same was attempted. We consider this point also in our discussion of the case.

All the foregoing points are important to be kept in mind by any investigator who investigates the cases of alleged rebirth. Most of these points as has been mentioned above, were either totally ignored or lightly taken into consideration. We incorporate all these points in the study of such cases. It is thus clear that there is a gradual improvement in the methodology and the technique which is applied to the study of the cases of ECM. This improvement in the technique has not taken place, all at once, but the new techniques have been incorporated gradually in the light of experience gained in the process of investigations. The investigators are also aware that their method of investigation still has some draw-backs which they hope to eliminate in view of the knowledge which will be gained by them while studying new cases and re-examining the old ones about which additional data are available.

Summary of the Case

Prabhu son of Khairati of Salimpur village, District Bharatpur (Rajasthan), was born on Magh Sudi 2, Samvat 1975 (Sunday, 2nd February, 1919) When he was about three and half years old, he began to speak about his supposed previous life. One night (when it was raining), while sleeping beside his mother, he murmured, "How my children might be doing". His mother exclaimed, "What children?", and asked him to sleep as other children were also sleeping. Thereupon he told her that he had his own children but she lulled him to sleep without giving a thoughtful consideration to his utterance. After a month or so he again repeated the same words. On another occasion, sitting beside his mother who was churning butter, he said that she was extremely stingy with butter, since his previous mother had him sit beside the churn and gave him large pieces of butter from it. His mother asked him where his previous mother was. He then replied that she was at Hathori, that his real name was Hurbux.

This made his parents increasingly concerned and they asked him to tell about his previous life. He recalled that he was the Brahmin of Hathori, his father's name was Mudhe, he had a house of his own at Hathori, he had two sons—Ghure and Shyamlal and two daughters—Kokila and Bhouti. He further said that his elder daughter Kokila was married to Har Bhajan of village Kherli and the younger daughter Bhouti was married to Vallabh of village Navar. In the marriage of his elder daughter he accepted some money from the family of the boy but in the marriage of his younger daughter he did not.

One day he told his mother that occasionally he felt some pain in his knee. When asked, "Why?" he replied that prior to his taking birth in her family, he was having the body of a deer, a hunter fired a bullet at him which hit his knee as a result of which he died after suffering severe pain for some-time. On another occasion he recalled that he had buried some money in the stable of his house.

The news of this case then spread throughout the village. At Bhusawar (a market place where the people of Hathori and

Salimpur often meet on some business) the incident became the talk of the day and the news, somehow, reached Hathori. Having heard about such a case Ghure, the elder son of Hurbux came to Salimpur without sending any prior intimation to the parents of the child to this effect. Khairati, the father of the child who was sitting on the *Chabutary* of his house asked him to sit on a cot. The child was called from inside the house. He came out with his mother. No sooner did he see Ghure, than he spontaneously called his name and began to weep. Ghure returned to Hathori.

Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh of Hathori (who was then A.D.C. to Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur) also heard about this case. While dining with the Maharaja he talked to him about the case. The Maharaja himself was very much interested in such cases. He ordered that the child should be presented to him. The next day the child appeared before him. The Maharaja asked Bhagwat Singh to hide himself and appear before the boy when asked to do so. The child was bewildered to see the glamour and glitter of the palace. He was looking hither and thither. He was given some toys to play with so that he might settle down and open up for questioning. The Maharaja asked him, "What is your name? To which village do you belong?" The child promptly replied "Of which birth of mine are you talking Sir? Do you mean the name of my previous birth or of the present?" The Maharaja said, "Tell me of your previous birth as well as of the present one." Then the child said humbly, "In my previous birth I was called Hurbux and I belonged to village Hathori and in my present birth I am called Prabhu and I belong to village Salimpur."

Thereafter the child again began to play with the toys given to him. When he was busy in playing with the toys, the Maharaja beckoned Bhagwat Singh to appear before the boy. When Bhagwat Singh made his appearance, the Maharaja asked the child pointing towards him, "Who is this gentleman? Do you know him?" The child recognised him and at once said, "Yes, he is the son of my *Yajman*." He also called him "Chora" (meaning 'boy') and said, "I am Hurbux your *Purohit*." The

Maharaja then asked him, "Do you have the knowledge of the village Hathori ? If so then describe the place". "Yes", came forth the reply, "There is a fortress and a pond at Hathori The gate of my house is towards the East" Then Nathulal the nephew of Hurbux was sent for by the Maharaja who came running to the drawing room where the Maharaja was sitting and stood silently bowing his head in reverence He was the Chief Coachman of the Maharaja The child recognised him too saying, "He is the son of my brother"

All this amused the Maharaja very much He ordered an inquiry into the case The task of investigation was assigned to the charge of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal,¹ C. I E

-
- 1 Many sided efforts were made to collect full particulars of this gentleman There had been a series of informal talks with different persons who advised us to contact the following persons who might possibly help in giving details about Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal Hence initially inquiries were made from the following —

(1) The British High Commission, New Delhi, (2) The Collector, Gwalior, (3) The Secretary, Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras, (4) The Secretary, Theosophical Society, Varanasi, (5) Shri B P Sood, Collector, Bharatpur, (6) The Director, Archives Department, Bikaner, (7) Prof R N Chatterjee of Mayo College, Ajmer, (8) Dr Fioz Ali, Banasthali Vidyapeeth, Banasthali and (9) The Secretary, Radha Swami Satsang, Dayalbagh, Agra

These sources could not furnish us with the required information save a very brief account received from the British High Commission New Delhi According to the official record available with the Commission, Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal was the Prime Minister of Kishangarh He had been the Minister of Alwar and Gwalior States and had occupied a number of important posts during the tenure of his service He died on the 24th December, 1927 Prof Ernest Wood in his article "Evidences for reincarnation" published in *Ancient Wisdom* (Vol XXII, No 7, September, 1956) has stated that Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal was the Prime Minister of Gwalior State in the North of Central India He has described him as "the man of great probity and responsibility (See Appendix III)

who according to Prof Ernest Wood, was a man of great probity and responsibility. His inquiry into the matter had two phases. In the first phase, the child's statements were recorded at his father's house, in March, 1923 by the Naib Tehsildar.² In the second phase, the child at his request was taken for a test to Hathori by the Tehsildar of Weir.³ The results of his investigation were first published in some Hindi Magazine

However, informal talks with some local persons later revealed that full particulars of late Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal could be obtained from his two sons—Shri Bal Govind Das Loiwal, 11, Middleton Row, Calcutta and Shri Bal Gopal Das Loiwal, 87, Rajpura Road, Dehradun. The concerned persons were then contacted who sent us a bibliographic note on their father together with other written accounts of him. They also sent us a copy of the memorandum concerning the "Memory of Past Life Research Association" (Appendix IV). He was President of the Association which is now no longer in existence. This association aimed at studying the alleged cases of memory of past life, empirically and objectively. Details about the aims, objectives, organisation and the type of research undertaken by this Association were sought from the following persons as suggested by some interested persons: (1) Shri N Sri Ram, President, Theosophical Society, Adyar, Madras, (2) Diwan Alakdhari, Ambala-Cantt, (3) Shri Gopiraj Kaviraj, Sagra, Varanasi; (4) Secretary Radha Swami Satsang, Dayalbagh, Agra, and (5) Shri Sri Prakash, Swarg Ashram, Dehradun. But none could send us any particulars about the Association. Shri Ram Gopal Mishra, was the Secretary of the Association whose address was not traceable. However, we could find out his present address. On contacting him on phone and through letter, he informed us that he would be sending to us the details about the Association and also the inquiry of the case of Prabhu within his knowledge. We have now received from him a copy of the booklet of the Memory of Past Life Research Association published by him, which contains the procedure of investigation of the alleged case of rebirth (See Appendix XV).

2 & 3 There is much controversy about the name of the official who went to Salimpur to record the statements of the child and that of another official who took the child for a test to Hathori. This discrepancy has been discussed in detail under "*Discrepancy*"

"KALPAKA"⁴ and subsequently in a French periodical *Revue Metapsychique*⁵

- 4 A great deal of correspondence was devoted to the acquisition of a copy of the Hindi magazine 'Kalpaka' Dr G Geley, then Editor of *Revue Metapsychique* (1924) while publishing the report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, stated in the Introduction that the Hindi Magazine 'Kalpaka' had "recently published the results of the investigation" Letters were written to the Librarian, Indian National Library, Calcutta and some persons interested in the study of such cases, requesting them to send a copy of the issue of the said magazine containing the report of Dr Shyam Sunderlal It was through the Assistant Librarian, National Library, Calcutta and Shri Balch and Nahata, a critical Researcher, 46, Strand Road, Calcutta that the investigators came to know that a magazine called 'KALPAKA' was not in existence at all but a Hindi Magazine "Kalpa Briksk" was published from Ujjain in the year 1922-23 and it is still being published from the same place The Librarian replied that the copy of the issue in question was not available with him

The Editor "Kalpa Briksk" was then addressed a number of times to furnish a copy of the relevant issue of the Magazine He was sent phonogram also but from him no reply was received at all Other sources were tapped for obtaining a copy of the issue of the said magazine containing the report of Dr Shyam Sunderlal On being advised by some interested persons contacts were made through correspondence with the following — (1) Dr E J Dingwall, Pinehill, Crowhurst Battle, Sussex, England, (2) The Assistant Keeper, Department of Oriental Printed Books and MSS, the British Museum, London, (3) Mr P K Banerjee Head of the Department of Library Science, Vikram University, Ujjain, (4) The Director, 'Nagri Pracharini Sabha' Kashi (India), (5) The Registrar Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag (India), (6) The Secretary, 'Hindi Samachar Patra Sangrahalaya', Hyderabad (India), (7) The Assistant Secretary, 'Nagri Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi, (8) Prof B N Ganguli, Varanasi, (9) Mr Prabhat Misra, Prayag (India) (10) Editor "Kalpataru" Bharat Dharam Mahamandal, Varanasi, and Sri Gopinath Kaviraj, Sigm, Varanasi None of them could supply the required information except Mr P K Banerjee who informed the Department after having gone through personally all the issues of 'Kalpa Briksk' for the period 1922-24, available with the office of the said periodical at Ujjain, that the report of Dr Shyam Sunderlal was not published in any of the issues of the

As directed by the Maharaja, the child was taken to Hathori by Chowdhari Ram Swaroop, Naib Tehsildar of Weir. They reached Hathori in the evening and stayed at the house of Lumberdar Goverdhan Singh which was on the outskirts of the village. Next morning some chief persons of the village were called and the child recognised them spontaneously speaking

said periodical during the aforesaid period. Then all the agencies mentioned above were again requested to trace out any magazine bearing the title beginning with the alphabet 'K' in which the report in question might have appeared but no trace could be made of any such magazine. Shri Ram Gopal Mishra has stated that it was *Kalpoka* in which the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal was published. He has also supplied the address of this periodical. We have now written to the Editor, "*Kalpoka*", Tinnelvely—South India for the purpose.

- 5 The report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal was also published in the July-August No. 4, 1924 issue of the French periodical "*Revue Metapsychique*". We requested the following to supply us with a copy of the said issue of '*Revue Metapsychique*'—(1) The Secretary, Institute Metapsychique International, Paris (France); (2) The Director, The Central de Documentation Bibliothèque, Paris 7e (France); and (3) The Secretary, Society for Psychical Research, London.

The Institute Metapsychique International, Paris has sent us the requisite copy of the issue of '*Revue Metapsychique*' which contains the report of the case of Prabhu, by Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal and the Director, the Centre de Documentation, Paris, has sent us the Microfilm of the said article published in '*Revue Metapsychique*'.

We got the article translated from French into English by Mrs. Gudrum Gunther, Lecturer in French, University of Rajasthan (India) and it is this English translation of the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, on which we have based most of our observations though many items involved were personally checked by us on the spot.

Prof. Ernest Wood mentions (Appendix III) that an account of the case of Prabhu was also published in "*The New York Times*" (September 16, 1923). This account has been quoted by C. W. Leadbeater in his book "*The Other Side of Death*" (Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras, 1928—pages 798-799).

out names of some of them. The State official then verified the statements of the child recorded at his father's house in Sahimpur. Most of them were found to be correct in every detail. When this inquiry had been concluded, the child was asked to find his previous house in the village. A crowd had assembled by that time. He set off going ahead of the crowd, walked a few steps, then stopped hesitating. After a few moments, he again started walking. There are two narrow roads divided near the house of Mangal but the child took the path leading to the house of Hurbux without stopping for a moment to think at the crossing.

He entered the porch of the *Hevel* in which there were other houses as well besides that of Hurbux. The official asked the child pointing towards the first house near the entrance of the *Haveli*, "Whose house is this?" He at once replied, "This is the house of Rampal Jat." That house was really owned by Rampal Jat. Then he walked further and stood before the house of Hurbux which was in a dilapidated condition. After a moment he said, "This is my house."

Sri Govind Brahmin of that village was standing near the house of Hurbux at that time. The child spontaneously shouted to the utter surprise of the bystanders "Oh, Sri Govind! Do you remember, we had a quarrel over the house and one day you came out with a sword and I threw your sword away?" The very moment, Shiv Narain, the younger brother of Sri Govind appeared on the scene and the child exclaimed looking at him, "Why, Shiv Narain, did a quarrel not take place between us?" To this, Shiv Narain admitted that a quarrel did take place between Sri Govind and Hurbux.

Then the child pointed out the spot where he claimed to have buried rupees five which he got from one of his *Yayman* as gift. The particular spot was dug immediately in presence of them all, and a small earthen pot containing rupees five was really found buried. After a stay of about two days at Hathori, the child was brought back to Salimpur.

STORY OF THE CASE AS BASED ON EVIDENCE ABOUT WHICH THERE IS COMPLETE CONFORMITY OF STATEMENTS

The child Prabhu, son of Khairati of Salimpur one night while sleeping beside his mother, trembled and murmured, "O Rama, my children are in a terrible condition". His mother, however, lulled him to sleep without paying any heed to what he had said in a low voice. After a few days, he again repeated the same sentence whereupon his parents asked him to tell about his supposed previous life. He then told them that his name was Hurbux; he belonged to Hathori and that he had sons and daughters. News spread in the village and the people became anxious to know about the details of his previous life.

The boy recalled many items of the life of the Identified Person. He recalled that he had two sons and two daughters. In the marriage of one of his daughters he accepted money from the party of the boy but got married his other daughter without accepting any money. He also recalled that he had buried some money in the stable of his house at Hathori.

At Bhusawar, this incident became the talk of the day and the news, somehow, reached Hathori. The elder son of Hurbux having come to know of the child of Salimpur claiming himself to be Hurbux of Hathori, paid a visit to Salimpur without giving any prior intimation to the party of his arrival. He was spontaneously recognised by the child¹. No one was seen to have come to Salimpur from Hathori previously nor did the child ever go to Hathori with his father. Hence, there appeared to be no exchange whatever between the two parties prior to the incident.

1 This incident is reported here on the strength of the testimony supplied by the primary witnesses at Salimpur Khurd

Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh of Hathori (who was A.D C to the Maharaja of Bharatpur) also heard the rumour about the case and was the first man to inform about it to the Maharaja who being interested in such cases, ordered an inquiry which was supervised by a high State official

The child was first called at the roynl palace at Bharatpur by the Maharaja who interviewed him. The child was said to have given out many details about his supposed previous life which interested the Mnaraja who ordered the Tehsildar of Weir to take the child to Hathori for recognition test His statements recorded at his father's house in Salimpur were verified by the official

Thereafter he was asked to find his previous home in the village He set off, walked a few steps, then stopped hesitating. After a moment, he again started walking After some hesitation he went by himself right to the previous house The way to the house was long and full of turns but the child nevertheless reached the end unaided The next day he was brought back to Salimpur

PROCEDURE OF INTERVIEW

(Procedure followed while interviewing witnesses)

In the investigation of cases suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory, holding of interviews with the Subject and the witnesses in suitable psychological atmosphere, forms a major part of the success of the investigation. The atmosphere is to be generated by the investigator by properly understanding the situation, by giving appropriate suggestions and behaving in a friendly manner. On our part we observed all the pre-requisites of a good interviewer during the investigation of the present case and tried our best to make a thorough investigation of the case

When the investigator reaches the scene of the investigation, he should try to understand closely the social, familial and individual position of the case from the sociological and psychological points of view and for this reason the investigator should not reveal his identity or purpose of his visit immediately. He should try to establish friendly relation with the people of the locality. When we reached the village Salimpur it was about 2 p.m. and there contacted some persons. Since Sri Ram Swaroop had met us in the way we left him at a distance from the house and asked him not to appear on the scene unless asked for. We told them we were out on tour to study cases of reincarnation wherever they had taken place and we also gave out suggestive references of one or two cases. At this, the people referred to the case of their locality which we intended to study, we encouraged them to speak about the case and prepared a note about the details we got from those who were not directly associated with the case. The establishment of friendship with people not directly associated with the case is necessary to create psychological atmosphere so that they may

*See—"Manual for studying cases of E C M "

be frank to reveal the details which may not be given or noticed by the person directly associated with the case. This also helped us to ascertain the value of the case and reputation of the family in which the case had taken place.

It has been the experience of the investigators that if the case is weak or has been concocted by the party, someone in the locality comes forward and points out as such. Thus this type of indirect inquiry is helpful to the investigator. In this case no one informed us that the case was a fabricated one though most of the witnesses did not remember the details of the case chronologically. They forgot the names of the persons also who investigated the case and they found it difficult to recollect the details of the case.

After preparing the ground for the study in local society, we sent a message to Shri Ram Swaroop who is the head of the family to meet us and give us the necessary details of the case. We clearly explained to him and other witnesses that our study was purely academic in nature and had in no way any legal bearing. Shri Ram Swaroop is literate and he understood our purpose. This clarification was necessary, since villagers in India are familiar with legal enquiries only and so it was likely that they would have misunderstood our investigation as such. He and other witnesses extended their full cooperation in the investigation.

The treatment which the Subject and the witness received from the preceding investigators greatly determine their present relation with the investigator. If the primary witnesses in general and the Subject in particular have met with unpleasant treatment from former investigators, their attitude towards all the investigators happens to be less cordial and a little suspicious. In our present study we did not notice any hostile attitude on the part of any witness either at Salimpur or at Hathori, though some witnesses showed their apathetic attitude towards the investigation and said that it was of no use to study a case which had happened about more than forty years ago. Most of the witnesses we interviewed were

forgetful of the incident that took place. We encouraged the witnesses to speak freely so that their train of memory might start functioning as per the free association process. This technique greatly helped them to recollect the required details of the case

The fact that the investigator should inculcate in the witnesses the feeling of authority over them he being the expert before their eyes, helped us greatly in eliciting the required information of the case.

One thing that every investigator of such cases should bear in mind is that he should approach the concerned persons with care. He should remember that he is an outsider who is interested in the innermost and private details of the family. Besides this he should also remember that he will have to encounter peculiar attitudes and beliefs of the concerned persons which may not be digestible for him and he may also feel the resistance. But he should not impress his distaste and non-conformity with the viewpoints of the witnesses. On our part we listened to the witnesses patiently without commenting anything or passing any remark on what they had said

Interest, acceptance, empathy and flexibility on the part of the investigator play vital role in making the interview with the Subject and the witness a success. Interest of the investigator in the Subject and the witness encourage them to talk freely. It assures them that they are talking to someone who genuinely appreciates their viewpoint. Every human being earnestly desires to be heard and appreciated. If the investigator is able to show his interest in the case and in the concerned persons, they are sure to talk about things which may otherwise remain inhibited in their minds

Then, the witness in the case will speak about the innermost secrets which may have bearing on the case only to a person who is able to give an impression that they are being accepted unconditionally and that he can be relied upon. Hence it is necessary on the part of the investigator to show complete

acceptance of whatever the Subject or the witness says. During the interview the Subject or the witness may say things which may generate emotions, surprise, disgust and anger. But the investigator should resist them otherwise they will hinder the Subject's or the witness's ability to express his or her innermost thoughts.

We behaved in such a way that it appeared that we readily accepted whatever the witnesses in this case had told us. They became confident of our unconditional acceptance of their viewpoint and gave out many details which we did not find in the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal. This was because of the fact that we kept the atmosphere at the time of the interview very friendly and lively which made the witnesses talk to us freely.

Empathy is also an important ingredient of successful interview. Empathy is the ability to feel what another person is feeling. During the interview session we particularly pointed out to the witnesses that there was nothing unusual about them. Much depends upon the degree of empathy which a candid investigator can indicate to the subject or the witness.

Next comes the question of flexibility. Interviews as a matter of fact should not be conducted rigidly according to some questionnaire specially designed for the purpose. There are certain factors peculiar to a particular case and hence the investigator has to prepare a list of questions to be asked of the witnesses and memorise the questions he has to ask. He should thus first ask general questions and when he is able to establish the required rapport with the witness, he may ask specific questions and even he may get the questionnaire filled up in his presence. We in the study of the present case, have observed this requisite of the process of interviewing the witnesses and thus could collect certain important data relevant to the case.

The use of language in interviewing the persons should be flexible. It is always desired that the local dialect should be

spoken so that the ideas of the investigator can best be communicated to the persons concerned and if he cannot do so he should take along with him an intelligent interpreter who understands the language of the people of the community of the particular area and communicate their thoughts to the investigator. Language should not come in the way of expressing ideas with witnesses

Though we are familiar with the local dialect of the people of Salimpur and Hathori yet we took with us Shri Mahaveer Prasad Jain* who is more familiar with their language than we are. He could talk to them freely in their dialect and they could also express their ideas freely about the case

There are some practical considerations which should be kept in mind by the investigator while interviewing the witnesses. A witness should not be interviewed in the presence of other witnesses nor should he hear the testimony of others. Accordingly, we interviewed all the witnesses in this case individually and not in the presence of any other person. This is to be done because in case the witness is interviewed in others' presence, he may not feel at home to speak freely and his spontaneity may be handicapped. If he hears testimony of other witnesses, his statement will be greatly affected.

After establishing rapport with the witness by asking questions about him and matters in which he may be interested we introduced ourselves to the witnesses and described in brief the purpose of our visit. We also told them that we already had some knowledge of the case but that we would like to get more details about it. We put them at ease by informing them that the data were being collected merely for academic purpose and there was nothing to worry about and that they might talk to us freely.

We conducted the interview in three successive phases. First every witness was asked to give in general, the outline of the whole story of the case. This procedure is helpful for it would

*He was taken with the research team as third party witness

initiate the associative faculty of the witness so that he might get clues to speak about important details of the case in the latter part of the interview when he is asked to provide more facts about the whole incident. By comparing this statement of the witness with that of other witnesses, the investigator would be in a position to determine the points of convergence of ideas and details in all testimonies thus recorded. This type of interview further indicated the chronological order of the case in our study of the case.

In the second phase, we tried to know more details of the case which we did with the help of the questionnaire especially designed for the purpose. This we could do only after we were convinced that we could establish full rapport with the witnesses and that they did not have any feeling against us which would inhibit them to disclose the facts.

Then in the third and the last phase we questioned the witnesses about the circumstantial evidence and other factors which might have influenced the case. Here we asked questions about the possibility of normal sources which might have affected the case and also tried to know the psychological and sociological motives which might have been in the background of the case.

We took down notes at every step which were relevant to our study of the case. As has been mentioned earlier, we took with us Shri Mahaveer Prasad Jain who acted as an independent observer in this case. In such studies it is necessary as a precautionary measure that some independent person should accompany the team so that he might observe for himself the whole situation and the procedure adopted in the conduct of the investigation and submit his independent report of his observation, if required.

STORY OF THE INVESTIGATION

During our first round of the tour undertaken in the month of December, 1963 to study some cases suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory, we happened to be at Bhusawar village (Distt Bharatpur) on the 25th of the said month. At Bhusawar we were to interview witnesses and to investigate the case of Laxmi, daughter of Sohanlal of that village. Having done our job at Bhusawar we were to make our departure for Bharatpur where he had stationed. It was getting dark. In order to relieve ourselves of the day's toil, we made a brief halt at a tea-stall in Bhusawar to have tea and some light refreshment. By chance, Shri Ram Swaroop, the elder brother of Prabhu happened to pass that way. He also stopped there to have a cup of tea. Just to familiarise ourselves with the people of the village and its vicinity, we started talking with this gentleman. He enquired from us the purpose of our visiting the place. Having come to know of the same, he declared himself to be the elder brother of Prabhu whose case was also to be studied by us.* We then asked him to tell us in detail about the incidents of the case in chronological order and he began to narrate the same. We set the tape-recorder to operate and the whole statement of Ram Swaroop was recorded. The details of the case were also noted down with the help of the required questionnaire. Then we returned to Bharatpur. The next day we had to go to Khareri Bag village in Bayana Teshil to interview the girl Laxmi who was herself not present in Bhusawar. Thereafter we proceeded to Mathura to study another case and hence we had to postpone the investigation of the case of Prabhu to some future date.

On the 5th of November, 1964, we received a telephonic message from Shri Brijendra Singhji, the Maharaja of Bharatpur

*This case was on our record. Some postal enquiries were made by us about it from the concerned party.

inviting us to study the cete in Bharatpur district which could not be studied previously due to pressure of other work and other studies. Accordingly, we prepared our theses to go on immediately. The next day we got up early in the morning and left Jaipur ready with the required equipment. It was 5.15 A.M. when we left Jaipur by our Departmental jeep in the college riding breech. At Dausa (32 miles from Jaipur) we made a halt to take our morning tea and breakfast. After breakfast, we again started on our journey to Bharatpur at about 7.15 A.M., but as luck would have it we had to stop at about 2 miles when the bearings of the jeep began to make a loud noise. We stopped and examined the machinery. To our surprise we found that the engine was fully exhausted because a little bearing of the oil intake had become loose and ultimately fallen some distance on the road and because of the exhaustion of engine, the bearing began to make noise. We could not proceed further. We had to drive back to Dausa for repairs. Another bolt of the same size would have stopped the flow of the oil but the bearings would not have been repaired there. Anyway, after a search for sometime we could find a mechanic who could repair the damaged part of the machinery, but the noise of the bearings could not be lessened. We had to drive slowly and cautiously. This took much time in reaching Bharatpur. It was 11.30 A.M. when we reached Moti-Mahal--the palace of the Maharaja of Bharatpur. We took our morning meal with the Maharaja at about 1.30 p.m.

It was beyond the capacity of our jeep to take us to the village of Salimpur and Hathon. We had to request the Maharaja for providing us with any other conveyance and he very kindly conceded our request and immediately ordered one of his drivers to take us to Salimpur that day in his car meant for hunting purposes. We are really grateful to the Maharaja of Bharatpur for this act of kindness and also making us stay with him as his personal guests. We left Bharatpur at 2.30 p.m. and reached Chonkarwara Bus Stand (29 miles south of Bharatpur). We got down to inquire about the route to the village Salimpur. Fortunately enough,

Shri Ram Swaroop, the elder brother of Prabhu again met us there with his son Shri Vishnu Dutt, who got down from a Rajasthan State Roadways bus which had come from Bharatpur, where both had gone in the morning. We took with us both the father and the son to the outskirts of the village and proceeded further leaving them there to follow.

On reaching Salimpur, we behaved in the manner required of an investigator of such cases. We were asked to sit on a cot in the *Verandah* of the house of a neighbour of Shri Ram Swaroop. For sometime we started talking about the village life and tried to understand the situation and followed the psychological technique mentioned elsewhere. Having overcome all the difficulties which are usually faced by a stranger to a village, we started interviewing the witnesses individually. According to the usual procedure of conducting interview in such cases as outlined elsewhere in this report, we proceeded with every item and interviewed the witnesses thoroughly. After recording their statements in full we asked the witnesses individually certain questions pertaining to their statements, relevant to the case and noted down important points. The names of the persons interviewed and their other particulars have been given in the 'Index of Particulars'.

The villagers appeared to be generous, hospitable and cooperating. When we had completed our enquiry, we were served with tea. The villagers expressed their pleasure at our presence in their village. Then we returned to Bharatpur in the evening reaching there at about 8.30 p.m.

The next morning at 9.30 A.M. we left the palace for Hathori. Since we did not know the route of this village too, we took the help of Shri Ram Swaroop who was picked up from his village Salimpur. We reached Bhusawar and then at a small village Jagriwanpur we came to know from a villager about Ghure the son of Hurbux who was reported to be residing in the neighbouring village of Bhore. We were informed that Ghure had died about 5 or 6 years ago. Then we again stopped at Bhore village where Ram Khilari and Lature who were

ploughing their fields informed us that Ghure had died about 8 years ago and that he used to perform the function of a priest in the temple at Bhore. We resumed our journey and reached Weir but without stopping at Weir we went straight to Hathori. As has been pointed out elsewhere, the route from Weir to Hathori is full of turns and dangerous pitfalls. We were fortunate in having an expert driver of the Maharaja who could drive dextrously and with great caution. At places our car moved in a slanting position sometimes towards the one side and sometimes towards the other. We were thus tossed thoroughly. At a distance of about 2 furlongs from the village of Hathori, we left the car and started on foot. On reaching the pond mentioned in the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal we made a little halt and checked the details about the pond and the double storeyed house built in it which was recalled by Prabhu. We found every detail to be correct. Then we also noticed the fortress and the wells mentioned in the report, which were recalled by Prabhu.

We were, therefore, taken to Shri Nathulal the nephew of Hurbux, who was fetching water from the well. We were made to sit in his house which was a temple of *Hamumany*. We enquired about Choudhari Bhagwat Singh and were informed that he had left for a neighbouring village on some private purpose just a few minutes earlier. We requested Shri Nathulal and Pandit Johari Lal Sharma, who had also come to us by that time, to send for Choudhari Bhagwat Singh as he was the important witness to be interviewed. We began to talk in a general way about the fortress and the fields and the people of that village. The same interview technique which was adopted at Salimpur was also adopted there at Hathori. After making the people, who had assembled there familiar with our purpose of visit, we started interviewing them individually. There were hardly four to six persons who were present. Most of the villagers were working on their fields. The statements of Shri Nathulal and Pandit Johari Lal Sharma were recorded. Pandit Johari Lal Sharma described the whole incident which happened before him in Hathori, quite vividly and with full confidence. He made characteristic gestures to indicate the

manner in which the boy Prabhu recognised the persons and behaved with them in a typical way. Then, the statements made by Prabhu and reported by Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal were checked by us from Johar Lal and Mangilal individually, who either differed or added greater details about certain items contained in the report. We could thus have a fairly good picture of the case.

By the time we could finish our interview with Shri Nathilal and Pandit Joharilal, Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh made his appearance. He returned from half way to another nearby village on getting an intimation of our reaching the village Hathori. We chatted with him for some time and then came to our point. Before giving his statement he wanted to know what others had said but we did not give him any clue. We interviewed him at length and noted down all the points. His statement was fully recorded. Thereafter, we all went to the house of Shri Mangilal who was also one of the spectators of the incidents that had happened at Hathori when the boy was taken there. After recording his statement, we went to the spot where the house of Hurbux was located. The entire "*Haveli*" is now completely under heaps of debris. A few stones appear in some remaining walls which too are in a dilapidated condition.

Having checked all the items of recall as contained in the report and recognitions made by Prabhu at Hathori and after recording the statements of the witnesses we decided to return. The sun was setting and the faint rays of the sun kept the way visible to some distance but then it grew completely dark. Then it became all the more difficult to pass through such a tedious route. Anyway, with great venture and courage the driver drove the car cautiously keeping his eyes wide open to the pitfalls and the abrupt turnings.

We somehow crossed half the way from Hathori back to Weir but at a turning where it was about knee-deep sand, the car went out of order. The shaft stopped working and hence the car would not move even an inch further. We were left in

a desperate condition. It was quite dark around us for miles together. There was not a single lamp burning in any direction. With our wide open eyes we could see nothing but darkness surrounding us from all directions. We all had to get down. The driver looked into the machinery and began to work upon it in the hope of setting it right with the help of torch light. In this endeavour, about two hours had passed and we all were left shivering in single blankets that we had with us.

Luck favoured us and the car came to order. We had to push it to some distance and then it was made to start. We reached Weir at about 9.30 p.m. From Weir there was no difficulty. The road was tarred and the car could go smoothly. We dropped Shri Ram Swaroop at his house in his village Salimpur and then reached Bharatpur at about 11 P.M., when we were expected to be back at about 4.30 P.M.

The next morning the Maharaja was to leave for New Delhi with his team of Assistants taking the car given to us, with him. We had, therefore, to request Shri B.P. Sood, Collector, Bharatpur to provide us with conveyance so that we could go to Ajhu village (22 miles from Bharatpur) to interview Raja Kishan Singh who was also associated with the case. The Collector also extended his kind cooperation and we could obtain a vehicle. First we interviewed Chowdhari Rewat Singh who lives in the city, Mohalla Gopalgarh and thereafter we went to Ajhu and gathered information from Raja Kishan Singh about the case. Whatever information he could give, we noted it down and then returned to Bharatpur. At about 3.30 p.m. we left Bharatpur by bus leaving our Departmental Jeep at the garage of the Maharaja for being towed down to Jaipur and reached Jaipur at about 8 p.m.

Relevant Facts of Geography —

The village Salimpur is 38 miles west of Bharatpur and Hathori 45 miles south-west of the city of Bharatpur. The distance between the two villages is about 15 miles but the

route is not direct. One has to go from Salimpur to Weir (10 miles) via Bhusawar (3 miles from Salimpur). The road is tarred but from Weir to Hathori the route is muddy, sandy and rocky at some places. The road is uneven having small but dangerous pitfalls at many places. The road approaching the village Hathori is perilous having mounts at certain places and at others dangerous turns with the circuitous route. But the road to Salimpur village does not have so much turns. It is plain but sandy about one mile from the main road (from Chonkarwara turning to Bhusawar road) to the village. There is another shorter route from Salimpur to Hathori but that is through the hillock and the least frequented one.

Salimpur is a small village having population of about 1200 persons. It lies off the main route from Chonkarwara Bus Stand to Bhusawara. After covering 2 miles from Chonkarwara there is a turning towards the west—the dirt road that goes to Salimpur (one mile from the turning).

Hathori is a remote village cut off from the main road. From Weir, a dirt road goes towards the South which has a zigzag way. The distance between Weir and Hathori is 5 miles but the route is trying and perilous. The village Hathori is surrounded by hills. There is a raised path paved with stones from the tank (1 furlong from Hathori) to the village.

Salimpur village does not lie on the route from Hathori to Bhusawar or to Weir nor does Hathori while going from Salimpur to either Bhusawar or to Weir.

TESTIMONY OF THE GANGA GURUS*

The investigators wanted to ascertain Hurbux's date of death from the witnesses of Hathori for which Pt Joharilal Sharma suggested them to contact Shiv Shanker Lapsia who was the *Ganga Guru* of the family of Hurbux. According to the address given by the Pandit, the investigators arranged to contact the person concerned personally at Soron (District Etah, U P). On contacting the party, it was revealed that Shiv Shanker Lapsia had died long ago leaving the age-old records of his *Yajmans* with his sons-in-law Uma Shanker and Shiv Kumar. When he became old, he thought it proper to transmit to posterity his legacy of all the documents and accordingly he handed over all the records to his son-in-law Uma Shanker as he did not have any son. He had only two daughters. A little later, his second daughter was married to Shiv Kumar Dube Hazara. He then decided to give some files out of his whole lot to the new son-in-law. Uma Shanker was, therefore,

* A Brahmin priest who conducts ceremonies by the side of the Ganges, is called *Ganga Guru*. According to the Hindu belief, salvation of a person takes place finally only when his ashes are immersed into the sacred water of the Ganges. This is the last ceremony of the dead performed by the members of his family for which they have to engage the services of a Brahmin priest. There are many family priests (known as the *Pandas*) who have been performing the last rituals of dead persons of their respective families for generations. It has been customary with them. No person is allowed to perform by himself the last ceremony of immersing the ashes of the dead person of his family without his *Ganga Guru*. When a particular *Ganga Guru* is dead, the authority of conducting the last ceremonies is automatically transferred to his son who succeeds as the *Ganga Guru* of the family of which his ancestors had enjoyed the privilege of becoming the same. Haridwar (U P) and Soron (U P) are among the famous places in India where the ashes of the dead are immersed into the sacred waters.—The *Ganga Gurus* are first to be contacted by the members carrying the ashes of the dead who then take them to the bathing place on the bank of the river and perform the rituals.

asked to give some files to Shiv Kumar Dube Hazara. He transferred some files to Shiv Kumar keeping a copy of all the relevant particulars in those files with him. In these transactions, the records of Hurbux's family went to the latter's share. Hence at present Shiv Kumar Dube Hazara is in possession of the old records of Hurbux's family. These records are maintained by the *Ganga Gurus* for centuries and are recognised even by the law-courts as authentic documents serving as evidence in a civil suit. Because of such a great importance attached to these records, the *Ganga Gurus* preserve them well and do not either give out particulars about a family till they are satisfied that the person seeking information about the family is either connected with the family or else he would not disclose the facts to other persons. They also accept some gifts prior to their giving out the required information. Therefore, with great persuasion could they (Uma Shanker & Shiv Kumar) be made ready to give out information about the family of Hurbux from their records.

The English Translation of the entries made in Hindi in their files is given below —

(A) Particulars* as per records with Shri Uma Shanker

(Son-in-law of Shri Shiv Kumar Lapsia)

First Entry —Hurbux came from Hathori on Chaitra Badi 30 Samvat 1941. Hurbux was the son of Mudhe and grandson of Baldeo. Baldeo had two sons—Mudhe and Bheeka. Mudhe had four sons—(1) Hurbux, (2) Samsukh, (3) Brijlal, and (4) Bhagirath, their mother's name was Achano who belonged to village Badi. Hurbux had two daughters—Kokila and Panchi. His wife Gauron daughter of Nathu, hailed from village Burwan Badi.

Second Entry —Mangilal came from Hathori on Baisakh Sudi 13, Samvat 2012 with the ashes of Ghure, son of Hurbux and grandson of Mudhe. With him came Rampyan.

* The particulars are in addition to those contained in the records which are in the possession of Shiv Kumar.

(B) Particulars as per records with Shiv Kumar Dube Hazara, son-in-law of Shiv Shanker Lapsla :—

Hurbux son of Mudhe and grandson of Baldeo came to Gangaji from Hathori on Chaitra Badi 30, Samvat 1955. With him came Fouzdar Nathu and his wife Gullo carrying the ashes of Mudhe. The name of Hurbux's mother was Achano and that of his wife Gauron, daughter of Nathu of village Burwari Badi. Hurbux had a son named Ghure and two daughters—Kokila and Panchi, residing in village Navar in those days

As to the date of birth of Hurbux, the Pandit suggested the name of Shanker Lal Jaga who could give the required information as the Jagas maintain such records. According to the address supplied by the Pandit, Shanker Lal Jaga was contacted personally at Hindaun (District Sawar Madhopur, Rajasthan). He informed the investigators that the required records were with his brother Ram Sahai who was out of station and was expected to be back in Hindaun in a month or so. Letters were despatched to Ram Sahai asking for the information but no response from him was received.

Shri S C Mukherjee, Research Secretary of our Department went for the second time to Hindaun to contact Ram Sahai personally for the purpose but he met with no success for Ram Sahai was again out of station. Shri Mukherjee came to know through some other persons of the Jaga community that the Jagas do not maintain records of the dates of birth of the individuals belonging to the families of their Yajmans. They simply note down the names of the newly born babes in the families of their Yajmans whenever they happen to go on a round.

Comparative chart showing the statements of Prabhu as verified by Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal on the one hand and Pandit Johari Lal and Mangilal on the other.

Statements made by Prabhu at his father's house (as per report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shynm Sunderlal) :—

Item No.	Statements	Comments by Dr. Rao B Shynm Sunder Lal	Comments by Pandit Johari Lal and Mangil Lal
1	2	3	4
1.	In my previous life, I was called Hurbux, I was a Brahmin of the village Hathori in Bharatpur.	A man called Hurbux had lived at Hathori and had died five years earlier He was the son of Muhde.	Hurbux Brahmin son of Muhde lived in our village long ago.
2.	I had two sons, called Ghure and Shyam Lal and two daughters called Kokila and Bholi, one of my daughters married Ramhet of Khorli, the other daughter married Gokul	All these details were completely true.	Hurbux had two sons—Ghure and Khatiya, and two daughters—Kokila and Bhouti. His elder daughter was married to Har Bhajan of Kherli and his younger daughter Bhouti was married to Vallabh of Navar.

Note —These statements of Prabhu as contained in the report of Dr Shyam Sunderlal, were got checked from Mangil Lal and Pandit Johari Lal individually after their statements had been recorded Mangilal could recollect incidents when asked about each item of recall though he could not tell them in detail beforehand Items concerning physical existence of objects or places were verified by the investigators personally

1	2	3	4
	of Navar I accepted some money for the marriage of my first daughter, but I married the second one without any dowry		Hurbux accepted money for the marriage of his younger daughter but for the marriage of his elder daughter he did not
3	I had a house in Hathori	Correct	Correct
4.	The house of Swaroop Jat was next to mine	Correct	Correct
5	Swaroop Jat had a son and a daughter	Correct	Swaroop Jat had four sons— 1. Pyare Lal, 2. Amolak, 3. Ram Chond, and 4. Muthalal and one daughter Ramki who was married at Khera
6	There was a raised path paved with stones there.	Correct.	Correct
7.	There was a tank in the middle of which there was a house and above the tank there was a Chhatra (domed Cenotaph)	Correct in every detail.	Correct in every detail

1	2	3	4
		Correct	Correct.
8	There were two houses one on top of the other in the tank		
9.	Hathori had three water wells for drinking as follows :— (a) Panharwala, shaded by two holy fig trees, (b) Kankarwala, shaded by plum trees, (c) Mooliwala, shaded by mango trees	The Panharwala well is in fact shaded by Holy fig trees. The Kankarwala well is dry and was dry already at the time of Hurbux The plum trees which did shade it have gone, only a fig tree remains. The well Mooliwala is unknown. There is a well Jhasroyawala, and it is shaded by a mango and a fig tree	There were three water wells in our village, the names of which were Panharwala, Kankarwala and Moosariawala well and not Mooliwala. The last well was shaded by five mango trees. There was no well called Jhasroyawala
10	I had a <i>Gujar</i> of the village of Bhore as <i>Yajman</i>	This statement could not be checked	Correct. The name of the Gujar was Ram Chand Prasadi son of Kallu.
11.	There is an inscription in a fortress at Hathori where there is a snake	There is a fortress at Hathori but there is no inscription or snake connected with it. How-	There was no inscription in the fortress but a legend prevailed in the village. There was a well in the

1	2	3	4
<p>12. In the year of the famine (Samvat 1934), I lived at</p>	<p>ever, there is a legend about these in the village Hurbux would have believed this along with his fellow villagers</p>	<p>fortress which contained, as was believed by the villagers, buried wealth A snake was believed to be keeping watch over it There was a condition binding on a person who dared to take out the buried wealth that he would have to sacrifice the lives of his son and daughter-in-law (husband and wife) before he could take out the buried wealth Once it so happened that Phozdar Ante of our village began to remove stones from the well Hardly could he remove a few stones when he was dismayed by the idea that he might be put to any harm So he ran away</p>	<p>Correct Hurbux survived during the famine by eating only</p>

Hathori and I had a pair of buffaloes with which I ploughed my fields

Gulars—a fruit of the banyan tree as other people in the village did.

13. I died during my father's life time in a bungalow outside the village.

Incorrect. Hurbux died after his father's death and in his home in the village

Incorrect. Hurbux died after the death of his father and his death took place in his home.

14. My father's name was Mudhe.

Correct

Hurbux's father was called Mudhe.

15. The name of my wife in my last life was Ganjo, which means "bald".

The wife of Hurbux was called Gauron, but she had been given the nick-name "Ganjo" because she was slightly bald.

(Nothing of this sort was in the knowledge of either Manglal or the Pandit).

16. My maternal uncle lived at Bugaon

His maternal uncle lived at Gugaman village.

17. My father-in-law lived at Burhwari

Correct.

18. Moola Jat fell into my well and I saved his life.

This could not be checked. No one remembered such an episode.

Moola Jat fell into the Kankar-wala well and Hurbux did save his life.

(B) Statements made by Prabhu at Hathori in front of the leading men of the village. The child repeated all his previous statements and added some new ones, as follows (as per report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal) —

- 19 He had three brothers :—
 (1) Gilla, who was still living when he (Hurbux) died, (2) Ghunni who died before he did, (3) a third brother whose name he could not remember.
- Hurbux had three brothers (1) Gilla Ram, (2) Chumlal and (3) Haret. (They did not remember their dates of death)
- Only partially correct Hurbux had only one brother who was called Sheobux. However, Ghunni and Gilla were his first cousins, sons of his uncle Bhola. And Ghunni had died before Hurbux did.
- 20 One day he found a snake in the jungle, had hypnotized it and then killed it with a tree.
- This episode could not be checked.
- (They did not remember such an episode.)
- 21 He was Purohit of the village of Bhoire.
- Correct. Hurbux's son is still priest in the temple of this village. He died about 8 years ago.
- Correct. Hurbux's son Ghure was the priest in the temple of this village. He died about 8 years ago.

REVIEW OF THE REPORT OF DR. RAO BAHADUR SHYAM SUNDERLAL

As has been mentioned earlier, the case was first investigated in 1923 and the inquiry was supervised by Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, C.I.E. The results of his investigation were published in some Hindi magazine probably '*Kalpaka*' and a little later in the July-August, No. 4, 1924 issue of the French periodical "*Revue Metapsychique*". We have on our record the English translation by Mrs. Gudrun Gunther, (Lecturer in French, University of Rajasthan, India) of the report entitled, "*Apparent cases of Memories of Past Lives*" published in French in the aforesaid issue. It is on this copy of the report¹ available with us that we have based most of our observations.

In his introductory remarks on the publication of the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal (hereinafter referred to as 'the Report') Dr. G. Geley, then Editor of "*Revue Metapsychique*", pointed out that the investigation into the case of Prabhu ordered by His Highness the Maharaja of Bharatpur, was assigned to the charge of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, C.I.E. and conducted with complete scientific procedure.

The inquiry was actually conducted by the officials and Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal simply supervised the same. His observations were, therefore, based on the report of the State officials who went to Salimpur to record the statement of the child and thereafter to Hathori with the child for a recognition test. The investigation was conducted in two phases. In the first phase, the child was questioned at his father's house in March, 1923 by the Naib Tehsildar of Weir and in the second phase, the child was taken for a test to Hathori, the village where he claimed to have lived in his previous life.

The procedure followed

The two-phase investigation of this case as mentioned above indicates that the investigator was cautious enough in adopting a procedure which adds to the authenticity of the

1 See-Appendix II.

ahead and recognise his house. He said, "There is a *Haveli* in the little fortress in which there are several houses. My house is one of them." He then started leading the crowd that was following him, walked a few steps, then stopped hesitating. After a few moments he again started walking. There are two narrow streets divided near the house of Mangilal but the child took the path leading to the house of Hurbux without stopping for a moment to think at the crossing. He entered the porch of the *Haveli* in which there were other houses as well besides that of Hurbux. He pointed out the first house as belonging to Rampal Jat and that was correct. Then he went a few steps further, then stood before the house of Hurbux which was in a dilapidated condition and said, "This is my house." Thus according to the testimony of the witnesses of Hathori, the child did recognise his house whereas according to the report he could not exactly locate his house in the middle of the ruins piled around there. There may be discrepancy about the recognition of the house of the Identified Person, but the recognition of the path leading to the house of Hurbux has been undisputed.

As to the recognition of the persons of Hathori, the Report explicitly mentions that the child did not recognize any of the people of Hathori, but this is again contradicted by the testimony we have gathered. According to Pt. Joharilal (who is the Primary Witness) the child not only recognised the four leading persons of the village but he also distinctly recognised Rampal Jat, Sampat—the grocer, Sri Govind and Shiv Narain. However, his testimony could not find corroboration of any other witness.

Nor does the Report speak about the recognition by the child of the tamarind trees and the spot where he claimed to have buried money as stated by the witnesses we interviewed. It thus transpires that the previous investigator did not pay much attention as he should have to the items of recognition by the child.

In view of the Naib Tehsildar's opinion and upon the suggestions of the Hon'ble C.C. Wilson, Special Agent to the

Governor-General of Rajputana, an effort was made to gather more testimony and to make certain that the child had no previous instruction about Hathori. For this purpose, the child's father was questioned whether anyone from the village of Salimpur had any acquaintance with Hathori. The testimony of Khairati, the father of the child was recorded by the Naib Tehsildar in which Khairati described the circumstances which led the child to speak of his supposed previous life and he also clearly mentioned that he had never been to Hathori and had no relations there "No one in our village had relations there or the least contact with it." With the testimony of Khairati, the report comes to an end.

The statement of Khairati that he had never been to Hathori is not corroborated by the statements of the witnesses we recorded both at Salimpur and at Hathori. According to the witnesses, he was known widely as a religious discourses and he often visited the neighbouring villages for delivering religious discourse on "Rukmani Mangal". He was occasionally invited at Hathori too for that very purpose. Thus his testimony is contradicted by that of the witnesses we interviewed.

Prabhu's declarations recorded at his father's house in village Salimpur and his further declaration recorded at Hathori in the presence of the chief persons of that village were verified by the previous investigator on arriving at Hathori as mentioned earlier. During the interview session, we on our part also verified the statements of the child individually from Pandit Johari Lal and Mangi Lal—the Primary Witnesses of the case and observed for ourselves the veracity of certain items contained in the Report. It is surprising to note that some items of recall by the child, originally found to be correct on verification by the previous investigator, were on our verification of the same, either contradicted by the witnesses or were lacking certain specific details which were then furnished by them *

* The comparative chart showing the statements of the child as verified by the previous investigator on the one hand and Pandit Joharilal and Mangal on the other has been given separately (Pages 43 to 48)

The details of item No 2, as for example, were found to be completely true on verification as per Report, but the witnesses named above contradicted certain details. According to them, Hurbux had two sons named Ghure and Khatri and two daughters called Kokila and Bhouti, Hurbux did not have a son named Shyam Lal nor a daughter named Bholi as mentioned in the Report. Further "one of my daughters," goes the statement, "married Ramhet of Khorli, the other daughter married Gokal of Navar." The witnesses* pointed out that one of Hurbux's daughters married to Har Bhajan of Kherli and not Ramhet of Khorli as mentioned in the Report and the other daughter married Vallabh and not Gokal of Navar. We got all these details of item No. 2 verified from Nathi Lal as well who is the nephew of Hurbux and his testimony corroborated that of the witnesses. There is a third testimony—that of Hurbux's *Ganga Gurus*—which is different from both the above. According to them, Hurbux had only one son Ghure and two daughters—Kokila and Panchi.¹ Further, according to the witnesses Hurbux had accepted money for the marriage of his younger daughter and not for the marriage of his elder one as mentioned in the statement.

Item No 5 in the Report mentions Swarupa Jat to be having a son and a daughter which was confirmed as true by the previous investigator. Here again, the witnesses differed and said Swarupa Jat had four sons—(1) Pyarelal; (2) Amolak, (3) Ram Chandra and (4) Muthelal—and one daughter called Ramli who was married at Khara.

A portion of statement No. 9 was also contradicted by the witnesses. They admitted that Hathori had three water wells for drinking—but their names were—Panharwala, Kankarwala and the third Moosariwala well shaded by five mango trees and not Mooliwala as stated by the child. There was no well called Jhasroyawala as mentioned in the Report.

* Unless otherwise stated the witnesses here referred to are Pandit Joharlal and Mangilal.

¹ Hurbux may be having only one son at the time when he visited his *Ganga Gurus* who record the particulars on the basis of personal testimony.

As to the item No. 10, we asked the witnesses whether Hurbux had a Gujar of the village Bhore as *Yajman* and if so, whether he could give us his name. They admitted this statement of the child to be correct and added that the name of the Gujar was Ram Chand Prasadi, son of Kallu. They seemed to be quite confident of what they had been telling us. This item could not however been checked by the previous investigator as stated in the Report.

The witnesses supplied us greater details about the legend prevalent during those days about the fortress at Hathori and a snake connected with it. There was no inscription in the fortress as recalled by the child (item No. 11)

Statement No 12 was confirmed as true by the witnesses. They further added that Hurbux had survived during the famine by eating only *Gulars*, a fruit of the banyan tree as other people of the village did.

As has been pointed out in the Report, statement No 13 was admitted by the witnesses also to be incorrect. They informed us that Hurbux had died after his father's death (though they could not give us his exact date of death) and his death took place in his house in the village. They however, could not verify item No. 17 as they did not have the knowledge of Hurbux's wife Gauron, nick-named "Ganjo", though the previous investigator found this statement to be true. According to him the wife of Hurbux was called Gauron but she had been given the nick-name "Ganjo" because she was slightly bald. We tried to verify this statement from other witnesses but no one remembered that Hurbux's wife was nick-named "Ganjo".

About the statement No. 21 regarding Moola Jat's falling into the well which belonged to Hurbux, the witness gave out details and said that the Jat had fallen into the Kankarwala well and Hurbux had saved his life.

There is a discrepancy in the testimony regarding statement No 22. The child said, according to the Report, that he had three brothers—(1) Gilla, who was still living when he (Hurbux) died, (2) Ghunni, who died before he died, (3) a

third brother whose name he could not remember. On verification the investigator came to know that this statement was only partially correct "Hurbux had only one brother", so runs the comments of the investigator, "who was called Sheobux. However, Ghunni and Gilla were his first cousins, sons of his uncle Bhola. And Ghunni had died before Hurbux did." But Nathulal besides the witnesses, pointed out that Hurbux had three brothers—(1) Gilla Ram, (2) Chunnī Lal and (3) Haret, and the testimony of the *Ganga Gurus* points to still third list. According to them, the names of Hurbux's brothers were (1) Samsukh, (2) Brij Lal and (3) Bhagirath. Thus there is no complete accord as to the names of Hurbux's brothers.

Excepting the above statements of the child in which the witnesses either differed or gave out greater details, the rest of them were confirmed by them as correct or incorrect as were found to be on verification by the previous investigator.

Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal has said in the beginning of his report that the Tehsildar of Weir had taken the child to Hathori but on page 6 he says, "The Naib Tehsildar added that in his opinion the child had not been given information about these matters by any one and he believed the case to be an authentic one of recall of a past life." From this remark, it appears that the report was prepared by the Naib Tehsildar when the person who had gone to Hathori with the child was the Tehsildar.

Again, at a little later stage, the Report speaks of the testimony of Khairati as it was recorded by the *Tehsildar of Weir** but further it has been mentioned in the capital letters that the testimony of Khairati was taken down by *Ram Singh, Naib Tehsildar**. The Tehsildar—Naib Tehsildar, controversy has already been discussed elsewhere which need not be repeated here.

Concluding Remarks

On the whole, Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal has tried to give a clear picture of the case. However, some points

*Italics are ours

of weakness in the procedure of investigation and recording of the evidence do appear on the surface. Proper recognition test* was not administered to the child and hence it cannot be known from the Report as to what items in what manner did the child recognise at Hathori which is an important factor in the study of such cases. Effort was, however, made by the investigator to gather more testimony and to make certain that the child had had no previous knowledge about Hathori and about the particulars given out by him but for this purpose only his father Khairati was questioned and no other witness was interviewed in this connection. Formation of relevant hypotheses and examining them objectively was, however, not done. The child's behaviour with his present relatives and as when he was with the people of Hathori should also have been keenly observed.

Apart from the many shortcomings in the Report, there are some points of significance which attribute to the inquiry a scientific attitude giving an objective account of an apparent case of memories of a past life. As has already been pointed out earlier, the declarations of the child were recorded by an independent observer prior to the attempt at verification. This did not allow either of the two parties to add or modify the statements of the child so as to match the details of the life of the previous personality. Then all the items of recall by the child were verified at Hathori by the investigator. On verification, most of the items were found to be correct while some to be incorrect. Besides, the investigation was conducted by the Tehsildar and the Naib Tehsildar who by virtue of their office get accustomed to circumstantial method of collecting evidence for legal cases and similar method is an important procedure of study in the study of cases of Extra Cerebral Memory.

The hypothesis of normal sources of information in the case was also touched upon though not fully examined. This shows that the approach was scientific though the whole procedure of investigation was lacking in many details. The child at

*Refer to "Model Recognition Tests for ECM Subjects" *Manual for studying cases of Extra Cerebral Memory*

Hathon was asked by the investigator to go ahead and find out the way to his house there. No hint or any suggestion whatever, was provided to him and the child recognised the way to the house unaided. Here too, we find that the test for recognising the house and the way leading to it was followed strictly by the investigator.

The investigation was thus conducted in scientific manner keeping objective attitude towards the facts of the case. Most of the shortcomings in the Report are due to the fact that it was not prepared in direct consultation with the original investigators or in reference to their written records which they might have prepared. If written records were not made by the Tehsildar or the Naib Tehsildar, the writer of the Report should have taken pains to interview them and other primary witnesses.

DISCREPANCIES

As has been pointed out earlier, the incidents of the case took place in the year 1922-23. Because of a very long period that has elapsed between the main events of the case and our reinvestigation of the same in the year 1963 and 1964, much of the memories of the witnesses have faded away and as a result of which many discrepancies in their statements with regard to certain items of vital importance to the case, have crept in. The witnesses, as is evident from their statements, were not fully sure about the chronological order of the incidents that took place. There was no person available who remained an eye-witness to all the incidents from the beginning to the end.

According to the story of the case, the first person who visited Salimpur on hearing about Hurbux's having reborn in the family of Shri Khairati of Salimpur, was the elder son of Hurbux. Now, some of the witnesses of Salimpur mention him as Ghure while others Latur. There are still some who are not sure about the name of the person who visited Salimpur but this much they are sure of that the elder son of Hurbux came from Hathori to Salimpur on hearing about Hurbux's taking rebirth in the family of Shri Khairati of Salimpur.

We tried to verify about the person who first visited Salimpur after the incident had taken place and came to know from the witnesses of Hathori that it was Ghure and not Latur who went to Salimpur. Ghure was the elder son of Hurbux. Persons of Hathori testified that there was no person named Latur who was the son of Hurbux. According to Nathilal, who is the surviving person in the family of Hurbux's father, Hurbux had two sons—Ghure and Khatiya. Ghure went to Salimpur and that there was no person named Latur as such.

Secondly, there is no agreement on the part of the witnesses regarding the name of Hurbux's second son. Some of the witnesses including Ram Swaroop, the elder brother of Prabhu said that Shyamlal was the name of the second and the younger son of Hurbux, while some said, it was Latur. No one in Salimpur stated that Khntiya was the name of Hurbux's second son. On the other hand, witnesses of Hathori said emphatically that Khatiya was the second son of Hurbux. Pandit Joharlal Sharma who was emphatic about every statement he made, also pointed out the same and his version was confirmed by Shri Nathulal who is the nephew of Hurbux. The report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal mentioned Shyamlal as the second son of Hurbux. We also tried to find out whether Shyamlal was another name of Khntiya but Shri Nathulal and Pandit Johari Lal Sharma denied it as such. According to the testimony of the *Ganga Gurus** of Hurbux living at Soron, District Etah (U. P.), Hurbux had only one son named Ghure. When all the witnesses speak of two sons and the records with the *Ganga Guru* speak of only one son, it may be that when Hurbux went to the Ganges with his wife carrying the ashes of his father Mudhe, he might be having only one son at that time and his second son might have been born afterwards and the entry about his name might not have been made in the records of the *Ganga Guru*.

The same is the case with regard to the name of Hurbux's second daughter. According to the report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, her name was Bholi. From the statements of Ram Swaroop, Pandit Johari Lal and Nathulal, her name appears to be Bhouti but the record of the lineage of Hurbux's family (available with Uma Shanker Chowdhari and Shiv Kumar Dube Hazara—the *Ganga Gurus* of Hurbux) reveals her name to be Panchi. When asked whether Bhouti was her another name, Uma Shanker and Shiv Kumar showed their ignorance about the same. Hence the name of the younger daughter of Hurbux as given by the witness is contradicted.

*See—"Testimony of the *Ganga Gurus*"

by the record maintained for centuries by Hurbux's *Ganga-Gurus* at Soren.

Similarly, there is no conformity about the names of the husbands of Hurbux's daughters. The child Prabhu stated (as recorded in the Report) that one of his daughters married Ramhet of Khorli; the other daughter married Gokal of Navar. According to Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal this statement on verification was found to be correct but Pandit Johari Lal, Mangi Lal and Ram Swaroop contradicted this statement and said that the elder daughter of Hurbux was married to Har Bhajan of Kherli and his younger daughter to Vallabh of Navar and further they also stated that Hurbux had accepted money from the family of the boy for the marriage of his younger daughter and not for the marriage of his elder daughter as stated to be correct by Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal.

Then again, the names of the brothers of Hurbux also do not find agreement. The report mentions that according to the statement of the child, he (Hurbux) had three brothers—(1) Gilla, (2) Ghunni and (3) a third brother whose name he could not remember. On verification it was found that Hurbux had only one brother Sheobux. However, Ghunni and Gilla were his first cousins. But the Pandit and Mangi Lal stated that Hurbux had three brothers—(1) Gilla Ram, (2) Chunni Lal and (3) Haret. According to the testimony of the *Ganga Gurus*, Hurbux had three brothers—Samsukh, Brij Lal and Bhagirath. There is thus no conformity of statement on this item of recall.

The name of the third well, viz., Mooliwala recalled by the child is also not undisputed. The report points out that this well was unknown. Instead, there was a well called Jhasroyawala but this is contradicted by the statement of the Pandit and Mangi Lal who said it was Moosariawala well and not Mooliwala or Jhasroyawala.

People of both the villages are not sure as to how the news reached Hathori. Some mention Harpyari's name while others reject it altogether. Here we find perhaps the greatest discrepancy in the statements of the people of Salimpur. The

witnesses Kajori Lal (P W. 5) and Smt. Basanti (S. W. 9) are of the opinion that Smt. Harpyari, daughter of Foudar Narain of Salimpur, who was married to Foudar Ishar of Hathori, might have communicated the news of Prabhu's identifying himself with the personality of Hurbux, to Hathori. But their version is rejected by Ram Swaroop (S. W. 1) who says her present age is 29 years only. She was not even born at the time when such an incident took place. His statement is confirmed as true by Mangal Ram (P. W. 3) in the light of the statement of Ram Swaroop and Mangal Ram, the statement of other witnesses appear to be ridiculous. This shows how uncertain the people of Salimpur are. No one (among the witnesses interviewed) is sure as to how news reached Hathori.

Then again, there is discrepancy about the name of the official who went to Salimpur to record the statements of Prabhu and that of another official who took Prabhu for a test to Hathori. Most of the witnesses of Salimpur stated that the State official who went to their village was a muslim having a long beard who was called the "Nawab". According to them he was the Tehsildar of Weir. On seeing his beard the child is said to have recalled that he also had a long beard in his previous life which got burnt while performing the ritual of "Hoh" burning. There were others who said it was Chowdhari Ram Swaroop, Tehsildar of Weir who visited their village. The witnesses of Hathori, however, stated that it was Tehsildar Ram Swaroop who brought the child to their village. The Collector, Bharatpur was requested to let us know the names of the Tehsildar and Naib Tehsildar of Weir during the period 1923-24. He informed* us that according to the records available in his office, Syed Abdul Qasim was the Tehsildar of Weir, District Bharatpur from 1st January, 1921 to 8th September, 1923 and Chowdhari Ram Swaroop worked as Naib Tehsildar and Magistrate II class in Tehsil Weir during the aforesaid period.

Now, if the letters of the Collector, Bharatpur and the testimony of witnesses at Salimpur and Hathori are considered

*Vide his D O Letter No. Dev/1732 dated November 12, 1964 and No. Dev/1778 dated November 24, 1964.

it becomes clear that the Muslim Tehsildar went to Salimpur to record the statement of Prabhu and the recognition tests were conducted at Hathori by Chowdhary Ram Swaroop, Naib Tehsildar, though this is not corroborated by the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal. According to the report it is just the reverse of it. People might not remember whether Chowdhari Ram Swaroop was Tehsildar or Naib Tehsildar.

Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh stated with confidence that after the retirement of the Muslim Tehsildar of Weir, Chowdhari Ram Swaroop was posted at Weir as Tehsildar. At the time when he went to Hathori to investigate the case, he was Tehsildar of Weir. On the other hand, Pandit Johari Lal Sharma pointed out that during those days the Tehsildar of Weir was a *Nawab* and Chowdhari Ram Swaroop was Tehsildar at some other Tehsil in Bharatpur district. But these statements do not find corroboration in the reply sent by the Collector, Bharatpur.

The importance of this point lies in the fact that if the Tehsildar who took the boy to Hathori were a Muslim, the authenticity of the recognition and recalls of the boy would have become significant because according to the Muslim religion, the Muslims do not believe at all in reincarnation and hence the attitude of the Muslim Tehsildar towards all the proceedings would have been more stringent than that of a Hindu person and the testimony of his verification would have carried greater weight.

As to the amount of money the child had buried at the stall for the cattle in his house at Hathori too, there is no conformity in the statement of the witnesses. People in Salimpur said that the child had stated rupees one hundred to have been buried underground and on verification the amount of rupees one hundred was actually found in the house of the Identified Person. But when we interviewed the witnesses at Hathori, we came to know that the child exactly located the place where he said, he had buried rupees five only. The particular place was ordered to be dug then and there and on digging, a small

earthen pot containing rupees five only was found which the child said, he got as '*Dakshina*' (gift) from one of his *Yajman*'s. He, however, could not recall the name of the particular *Yajman* from whom he had obtained rupees five as gift. Thus this is another discrepancy in the statements of the witnesses.

SUMMARY OF RECOGNITIONS MADE BY PRABHU

S. No. 1.	Recognition 2.	Informant 3.	Verification 4.	Comments. 5.
1.	Recognition of Ghure at Salimpur.	Ram Swaroop	Radha Krishna	Every Primary witness in Salimpur testified to the recognition by Prabhu of the son of Hurbux when he went to Salimpur for the first time though some of them were not sure about his name As soon as Prabhu came out of his house, he recognised him spontaneously and also called him by his name.
2.	Recognition of Bhagwat Singh	Chowdhary Ram Swaroop	Chowdhary Bhagwat Singh.	Hurbux was said to be the <i>Purohit</i> of the family of Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh. According to Ram Swaroop, Prabhu recognised Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh at Hathori. When he saw him, he called him " <i>Chora</i> " (meaning 'boy') and said, "I am Hurbux, your <i>Purohit</i> ". But Chowdhari

Bhagwat Singh when interviewed personally at Hathori informed us that he was not in Hathori at time He was with the Maharaja at the Royal palace in Bharatpur He confirmed that he was recognised by the boy when the boy was brought to Bharatpur and prevented before the Maharaja. He came to the scene and stood before the boy when recognised by the Maharaja to do so. The boy never saw him before

Nathulal is the nephew of Hurbux. He was the chief coachman of the Maharaja. He was present at the palace when the boy was brought to the palace of the Maharaja. On being asked by the Maharaja to recognise his Chief Coachman, the boy recognised him and said, "He is the son

3.

4

2

1

Nathulal

3 Recognition of Nathulal

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
----	----	----	----	----

of my brother" and then he also pronounced his name "Nathulal" correctly. When he pronounced his name, Nathulal gave him one rupee.

According to Pandit Jolarilal the boy recognised at Hathori the four chief persons of the village No. 4 to 7) He further stated that there were no persons named Sam Singh and Harknath as mentioned in the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal.

Revat Singh and Bhagwat Singh also confirmed that the boy recognised some important persons of the village, but they did not remember the names of the persons recognised.

4. Recognition of Foujdar Dharam Singh.	Pandit Jolarilal	
5. Recognition of Azmat Singh	As in item No. 4	
6. Recognition of Foujdar Swaroop Singh.	As in item No. 4	
7. Recognition of Harkanth Brahmin.	As in item No. 4	

1	2	3	4	5.
8.	Recognition of Rampal Jat	As in item No 4		The Pandit also testified to the recognition of Rampal Jat and Sampat, the grocer when they were presented to the boy
9.	Recognition of Sampat, the grocer	As in item No 8		
10.	Recognition of the house of Rampal Jat	As in item No 4		At the entrance of the <i>Haveli</i> in Hathon, Rampal's house was located. Next to his house was the house of Hurbux. Now the whole area is under the heaps of debris.
11.	Recognition of the house of Hurbux.	Mangil Lal	Pandit Joharlal	The route to the house of Hurbux is not direct. From the open ground in the village, his house is almost concealed. It is only when we go upto the house of Mangilal that a portion of Hurbux's house becomes visible. The fact that the boy, when asked to recognise his house, walked a few steps, then stopped hesitating.

then remembered and reached his house, was verified by Pandit Johari-lal. But according to the report of Dr Shyam Sunderlal he could not locate his house in the middle of the runs piled around there

12. Recognition of Shri Pandit Johari Lal Govind

Sri Govind was standing at the gate of his house which was next to the house of Hurbux. After recognising his house, the boy at once called Sri Govind by name and recalled a quarrel that took place between them about the house. Sri Govind, according to the Pandit admitted the incident to be correct.

13. Recognition of Shiv Pandit Johari Lal Naram.

When Shiv Naram, the younger brother of Sri Govind reached the scene, the boy recognised him spontaneously and referred the quarrel

1	2	3	4	5
				between him and Sri Govind to him (Shiv Naram)
14	Recognised the place where Hurbux had buried money	Pandit Johari Lal		<p>The discrepancy as to the exact amount has been pointed out elsewhere. The spot was ordered by the Tehsildar to be dug and on digging the particular spot a small earthen pot containing a few rupees was actually found.</p> <p>There is <i>complete conformity</i> regarding this point among all principal witnesses who were interviewed. Even the report of Dr. Shyam Sunder Lal states that the boy reached the place in front of the house of Hurbux unaided, but he could not recognize the house as it was in ruins.</p>
15.	Recognition of the path to the house of Hurbux	Pandit Johari Lal	Mangilal, Raviat Singh, Report of Dr. Shyam Sunder Lal	

RECALLS

SNo.	Recalls.	Informant.	Verification	Comments
1	2	3.	4.	5.
1.	My name was Hurbux	As per the Report of Dr. Shyam Sunder Lal	Pandit Jolairlal, Manglal and Nathlal.	A Brahmin named Hurbux had lived at Hathori. He was the son of Mudhe. The Report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal (hereinafter referred to as "the Report") mentions that Hurbux had died five years earlier (i.e., in the year 1918 A.D.) but the persons named in column No. 4 could not tell the exact date of his death. The Pandit however, suggested the investigators to contact his <i>Ganga Guru</i> at Soron and the <i>Jaga</i> family at Hindaun
2.	I was a Brahmin of the village of Hathori in Bharatpur.	As in item No 1.	As in item No 1.	
3.	I had two sons—Ghure and Shyam Lal and	As in item No. 1	As in item No. 1.	According to the Report this statement, on verification, was found

5.

4

3

2

1

two daughters—
Kokila and Bhola

to be correct but Mangi Lal and the Pandit informed the investigators that Hurbux had two sons—Ghure and Khattiya and two daughters—Kokila and Bhola. Naini Lal, the nephew of Hurbux, also confirmed their statement about this item, is true. But Chowdhari Bhagat Singh in his statement mentioned that the boy recalled that he had only one son and two daughters. According to the testimony of the *Gargi Gauri* of Hurbux's family, Hurbux had one son Ghure and two daughters—Kokila and Panchi. It is possible that at the time when Hurbux went to his *Gargi Gauri* he might be having only one son and the other son might have been born afterwards.

1.	2	3.	4.	5
4.	One of my daughters was married to Ramhet of Kherli and the other to Gokal of Navar	As in item No. 1	As in item No 1.	The Report mentions this statement to be correct but according to the Pandit and Mangi Lal one of Hurbux's daughters was married to Har Bhajan of Kherli and the other to Vallabh of Navar. They were confident about these names Nathi Lal also endorsed their statements.
5	I accepted some money for the marriage of my first daughter but got my second daughter married without any dowry	As in item No. 1	As in item No 1.	Hurbux's accepting money for the marriage of one of his daughters is undisputed but the witnesses are not sure whether it was done for his elder daughter or for the younger one.
6.	I had a house at Hathori.	As in item No. 1.	As in item No 1.	
7.	The house of Swaroop Jat was next to mine.	As in item No 1	As in item No. 1.	

1	2	3	4	5
8	Swaroop Jat had a son and a daughter	As in item No 1.	As in item No 1	This statement is correct according to the Report but according to the two gentlemen named above Swaroop Jat had four sons— (1) Pyare Lal, (2) Amoluk, (3) Ram Chand and (4) Mutha Lal and one daughter Ramki who was married at Khera
9.	There was a raised path paved with stones there	As in item No 1.	As in item No 1	
10	There was tank in the middle of which there was a house and above the tank there was a 'Chhatra' (domed Canotaph)	As in item No 1	As in item No. 1.	
11.	There were two houses— one on top of the other in the tank	As in item No 1.	As in item No. 1.	

5.

1.	2	3	4.	5.
12.	Hathori had three water wells for drinking — (a) Panhariwala—shaded by two holy fig trees (b) Kankarwala—shaded by plum tree (c) Mooliwala—shaded by mango tree	As in item No. 1.	As in item No. 1.	There were three wells—(1) Panhariwala, (2) Kankarwala and (3) Jhasroyawala according to the Report. The well Mooliwala was unknown. Mangi Lal and the Pandit disagreed as to the third well. They said it was Moosariwala and not Mooliwala. The well Jhasroyawala was, according to them, unknown.
13.	I had a Gujar of the village of Bhore as <i>Yajman</i>	As in item No. 1.	As in item No. 1.	Correct according to the Report as well as according to Mangi Lal and the Pandit. The Pandit further added that the name of that Gujar was Ram Chand Prasadi son of Kallu.
14.	There is an inscription in a fortress at Hathori where there is a	As in item No. 1.	As in item No. 1.	This statement is undisputed. The legend connected with the snake in the fortress as mentioned by the

1.	2	3.	4.	5
	snake			Pandit, has been given elsewhere in detail This legend was described by the Pandit as he had heard from other villagers
15	In the year of the famine (Samvat 1934) I lived at Hathori and I had a pair of buffaloes with which I ploughed my fields	As in item No. 1.	As in item No 1,	
16.	I died during my father's lifetime in a bungalow outside the village	As in item No 1	As in item No 1	This statement is incorrect both according to the Report and the Pandit and Mangi Lal. Hurbux died after the death of his father and his death took place in his house
17	The name of my wife in my last life was Ganjo which means	As in item No 1	As in item No. 1.	'The wife of Hurbux was called Gauron' so goes the Report, 'but she had been given the nick-name

1.	2	3.	4.	5.
	"bald".			"Ganjo" because she was slightly bald Mangi Lal and the Pandit expressed their ignorance about the truth of this item.
18	My father's name was Mudhe	As in item No. 1.	As in item No. 1.	
19.	My father-in-law lived at Burhwari	As in item No. 1.	As in item No. 1.	
20.	My maternal uncle lived at Bugaon	As in item No. 1.	As in item No. 1.	Correct according to the Report but according to the above witnesses Hurbu's maternal uncle lived at Gugaman village. This might be possible that he had later shifted to the new village.
21.	I had three brothers (1) Gilla—who was still living when I died	As in item No. 1.	As in item No. 1.	According to the Report the statement is only partially correct Hurbu had only one brother who was called Shco Bux. However,

1.	2.	3	4	5
	(2) Ghunni—who died before I died			Ghunni and Gilla were his first cousins, sons of his uncle Bhola. And
	(3) A third whose name I do not remember			Ghunni had died before Hurbux died but according to the testimony of the above named persons and Nathi Lal, Hurbux had three brothers (1) Gilla Ram, (2) Chunni Lal and (3) Haret but they did not remember their dates of death
22	Moola Jat fell into my well and I saved his life	As in item No. 1	As in item No 1,	This statement could not be checked by the State official The Pandit added that Moola Jat fell into the Kankarwala well and Hurbux did save his life
23.	My mother used to give me large pieces of butter	As in item No 1.	As in item No 1.	

BEHAVIOUR

S No 1.	Item 2.	Informant. 3	Verification. 4.	Comments 5.
1.	S embraced Ghure, the son of IP when the latter visited Salampur	Mangal Ram		The informant's this particular statement was not corroborated by any other witness though he said that he had noted this behaviour
2.	S designated Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh as 'Chora' when he saw him at the palace of the Maharaja of Bharatpur.	Ram Swaroop	Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh.	S's behaviour with Bhagwat Singh was typical of IP who used to call him 'Chora'. It was no joke to call Bhagwat Singh in such a manner as he was highly placed in the State service during those days and he was in the good books of the Maharaja too.
3.	S behaviour with Sri Govind, Shiv Naram and the leading men of Hathori closely resembled that of IP with them	Pandit Johari Lal		Pandit Johari Lal made certain anties to show how S behaved with the people of Hathori and also added that S's behaviour was quite in keeping with that of IP with them

E M O T I O N

S No	Item	Informant.	Verification	Comments
1.	2	3	4	5
1	S wept when he saw Ghure for the first time	Mangal Ram	Kajori Lal	Tears in the eyes of the subject when he saw Ghure, the son of IP for the first time show how much he was emotionally attached to him

DISCUSSION

The details of the supposed previous life recalled by the child Prabhu convinced the Naib Tehsildar, the Tehsildar of weir and Dr. Shyam Sunderlal of the genuineness of the case. Other primary witnesses who were interviewed also showed satisfaction with the case and pointed out that it was really a case of reincarnation. Except a very few statements of the boy, his other statements on verification by the investigators were found to be correct. They were also of the opinion that the child could not possibly get information about Hathori through any normal means.

As to the recognition of certain persons in Hathori and of Ghure in Salimpur, the report of Dr. Shyam Sunderlal is silent. However, the witnesses interviewed at Salimpur pointed out that the child did recognise the person who had come to that village from Hathori though they were not sure about his name. Some said it was Ghure, others said it was Latur. There were still others who did not remember his name at all. But no one said that the son of Hurbux who had been to Salimpur was not distinctly recognised by the boy.

Then again, according to the statements of Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh and Shri Nathulal, the child recognised both of them at the Royal Palace at Bharatpur, though Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh could not testify to the recognition of Nathulal in his presence nor could Nathulal do so in case of Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh. As a matter of fact, Nathulal was not present at the time when the child was asked by the Maharaja of Bharatpur to recognise Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh as stated by Nathulal himself. But Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh was present at the time Nathulal was called by the Maharaja. But still Bhagwat Singh did not remember whether Nathulal was recognised by the boy. As has been stated by Bhagwat Singh himself, he was a very busy man. He was at the height of

his glory and therefore it was just possible that he might not have paid much attention to what had happened at that time

While discussing the report of Dr Shyam Sunderlal, it was pointed out that according to the report the child "could not exactly place his house in the middle of the ruins piled around there" though he reached the end. But the primary witnesses in Hathori testified to the recognition of the house of Hurbux distinctly by the child and Pandit Joharilal also described the manner in which he had recognised the house. The child was asked to go ahead and find out his house. He set off and a small retinue of people followed him. He walked a few steps, then stopped hesitating. After a few moments he again started walking. Without stopping for a moment to think which path to take at the house of Mangilal where the road is divided into two narrow roads, he went along the path leading to the house of Hurbux. He entered the porch of the *Haveli*, recognised the house of Rampal Jat and then stood before the house of Hurbux (then in ruins) and said, "This is my house." The recognition by Prabhu of the path leading to the house of Hurbux unaided was an undisputed fact though there may be discrepancy about the recognition of the house. Prabhu had never been to Hathori according to the testimony of the witnesses. How could he then find the way? The report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal and the testimony of all the primary witnesses are very clear about it. How could he reach unless he was guided?

Similarly, recognition of any person at Hathori by him was denied by Dr Shyam Sunderlal. According to him, when the child was taken to Hathori, the four chief persons of the village were presented to him next morning but he does not say whether the child recognised them at all. But Pandit Joharilal and Mangilal—the primary witnesses, testified to their recognition by the child.

Let us now examine the case in the light of three hypotheses mentioned earlier. The first hypothesis relates to the fraudulent motive behind the case. The report of Dr Shyam

Sunderlal does not cast any doubt about fraudulent contrivance of the case, rather, according to the report, the Naib Tehsildar became convinced after conducting the enquiry that the case was an authentic one of recall of a past life. Apart from the report, we tried to ascertain from the witnesses themselves who were interviewed at Salimpur and Hathori whether the case was fabricated but no one came forward to testify to the veracity of this hypothesis. All witnesses further testified that Khairati was a simple man and was popular for his righteous ways.

We tried to know if there was any publicity motive of the party of the Subject but we could not find any witness who could testify to such a motive behind the case. The child began to speak about his supposed previous life at the age of about one and half years. In the beginning, his utterances were not heeded to but when he began to repeat sentences, his parents, especially his mother took a note of it and then gradually all the other members of his family as well as his relatives began to ask him to tell them in detail about his previous life. Then the incident became known to the villagers but neither the report of Dr. Shyam Sunderlal mentions anything as to the manner in which the news spread among people of distant places nor could we find any witness either at Salimpur or at Hathori who could inform us as to how the news of the incident reached the Press. We also interviewed the persons associated with the case at Ajhu and in Bharatpur city but they too could not furnish us the required information. It was through the Introduction to the report of Dr. Shyam Sunderlal which was published in the French magazine "*Revue Metapsychique*", that we came to know that the case was first published in some Hindi Magazine 'Kalpaka'. As to the exact date of publication in the Hindi magazine and the contents of the item published, we can say nothing.

It was Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh who informed Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur about the case but he was not sure as to how he had come to know of it. When asked about it, he simply said, "There was rumour amongst villagers

of Hathori about the incident." Whether there was any monetary motive of the party concerned, cannot, therefore, be said. The case came to the notice of the Maharaja who was said to be interested in such cases. He sent for the child from Salimpur. The child was later given fine clothes to wear and some cash by the Maharaja and by his mother also who is said to have had brief conversation with the boy when he was brought to the royal palace. It may be argued that Shri Khairati might be knowing previously that the Maharaja was deeply interested in such cases and therefore in order to take advantage of the situation he might in collusion with Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh, have entered into an understanding that he would also be entitled to share some profit in the business. Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh might have, therefore, informed the Maharaja about the case. But no evidence has been found in support of this point of view.

The point whether Shri Khairati and the members of his family were given to the tendency of fabricating cases like this, also does not find support. Upon asking the witnesses about the disposition and the habit of Shri Khairati and the members of his family as to concoct cases of this type, it was told that they were not such type of persons as to stage a fraudulent drama. Hence the hypothesis that the case is a fabricated one does not seem to hold good though doubts remain persisting in our mind as to certain points discussed above. During the times of princely States under the British regime it was full of great risk for a person to fabricate cases and hence it seems improbable that the family of the child resorted to this means. Besides, Khairati did not try to gain any favour even after his acquaintance with the Maharaja.

The next hypothesis that there may be normal sources of information in this case is to be examined now. As has been mentioned elsewhere, the route to Hathori from Salimpur is not direct. We were informed by the people of Salimpur that there is another shorter route through the hill side but the main route is through Weir and Bhusawar. Bhusawar is a market place (*Mandi*) where the people of Hathori and Salimpur generally

meet and exchange talks. This was verified by the witnesses of both the places. The manner in which the news reached Hathori is not known to any witness. They simply said that there was a rumour about the case. Some mentioned the name of Smt Harpyari, daughter of Foujdar Narain of Salimpur, who was, according to them married to Foujdar Ishar of Hathori. They thought she might have communicated the news to the people of Hathori but their statement was refuted by others who said Smt. Harpyari was not even born by that time. It appears ridiculous that such a great discrepancy appears in the statement of the witnesses regarding the person who might have carried the news to Hathori. On verification, we came to know that Smt Harpyari is not more than 30 years old. She is married to Foujdar Ishar of Hathori. Since the case is more than 40 years old, she was obviously not even born by that time. Due to this forgetful nature of the people of Salimpur, many discrepancies in their statements about certain items have crept in which have been discussed separately under "Discrepancies".

Because of Blusawar being a common market place for the people of both the concerned villages, there remains the possibility of communication of information about Hurbux and his family to the family of the boy. But the witnesses testified that there was no exchange between the two families prior to verification. Some were not sure whether there was any sort of exchange between the two parties. The testimony of some of the witnesses points to the wide acquaintance of Khairati, father of the child who was a famous religious preacher. According to them Shri Khairati used to go to the neighbouring villages though not so often to give religious talks to the people and Hathori was also one of such villages where he used to go. Therefore, he developed acquaintance with many people. This is why when Ghure, the son of Hurbux went to the village Salimpur, Khairati atonce asked him the reason of his coming to that village without asking for his introduction. He was not a new man to him. People in Hathori also verified the fact that Khairati was a famous religious preacher who used to go to their village occasionally for delivering religious discourse.

on '*Rukmani Mangal*'. When asked whether any one of them had ever seen his son Prabhu with him in their village, they categorically denied the same. No one expressed his doubt about the integrity of Khairati, and they did not think that the particulars of the death of Hurbux and the details of his family were gathered by Khairati and communicated to his son Prabhu who might have been tutored to speak like that. Nor did they speak of any other person who might have communicated the particulars of Hurbux's death to Khairati in Salimpur. In his statement, recorded by Naib Tehsildar Ram Swaroop (according to the report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam-Sunderlal), Khairati also stated that he had never been to Hathori and had no relations there. He further stated that no one in his village had relatives there nor the least contact with that village. But, however, this is perhaps the greatest weak point of the case.

As to the third and the last hypothesis—whether the case is suggestive of Extra Cerebral Memory—it may be said that so far as recognition of items at Hathori is concerned there is a divided opinion. In the opinion of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam-Sunderlal, the child could not recognise anybody at Hathori. On the other side the testimony recorded by us points out that Prabhu recognized some persons at Hathori, Salimpur and Bharatpur. This dispute is major and its solution is not available.

But the recalls of the boy were vivid. The items of recall as tabulated in the table of Recalls were got checked previously by the Tehsildar of Weir who went to Hathori with the boy and again by us recently when we went to Salimpur and Hathori. According to the Report, the child recalled that the name of his wife in his previous life was Ganjo which means 'bald' and this statement on verification was found to be correct. This recall by the child is vivid because it gives greater details about the wife of the Identified Person. She was slightly bald and hence nick-named 'Ganjo', but the persons of Hathori could not say anything about it when asked by us.

Recall of the details pertaining to the acceptance of money for the marriage of one daughter of the Identified Person and not for the marriage of the other is also significant. This item of recall was found to be correct on verification.

Then, the description given out by the child when he was questioned at his father's house in Salimpur—of the tank, the fortress, the path, the wells of Hathori and the spot where he claimed to have buried rupees five, was found, on verification, to be correct in every detail. These items of recall are quite vivid and remarkable. The Naib Tehsildar also added, in conclusion, that he believed the case to be an authentic one of recall of past life.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The case lacks potentiality because of certain discrepancies found in the statements of the witnesses. Because of the lapse of a considerable long time between the main events of the case and its present study, people were not sure of the chronological order of the events that took place nor could they furnish definite dates about the death of Hurbux and the birth of Prabhu. In absence of these dates, the intervening period could not be calculated, which is a vital point of consideration in the study of such cases. Possibilities of normal sources of information remain open though testimony of the witnesses to this effect is silent. The date of birth of Prabhu could however, be known from his horoscope produced by his father before the State official who first investigated the case.

If the report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal is taken as depicting a true picture of the case then most of the testimony furnished by Pnndit Johari Lal, Mangi Lal and Nathilal falls through. But if their testimony is considered to bear greater authenticity then the findings of the Report turn out to be incorrect. Most of the statements of Prabhu were on verification found to be correct by the previous investigator but some of them have been refuted by the Pnndit and other witnesses on their present verification.

There are some items of recall which are undisputed, there are others about which there is no conformity at all. Testimony is divided even as to the names of the members of the family of Hurbux. Though there are many shortcomings in this case, the case has been reinvestigated and reported afresh because of the reasons explained in the Preface to this report. Fraud may not be there but there is no distinct evidence either as to the paranormol source of information on the part of the subject in this case save his finding out the path to the house of the Identified Person unaided. The testimony of the people of Hathori,

no doubt, suggests the occasional visits of Shri Khairati, the father of Prabhu, to their village but nowhere in the statement of any witness either at Sahmpur or at Hathori, has it been found that Prabhu ever accompanied his father to Hathori. The house of Hurbux at Hathori is not situated at a conspicuous place. How could the child Prabhu who had never been to Hathori previously reach the destination unaided, remains inexplicable. Herein lies the strength of the case.

Because in most of such cases, both the parties come into contact with each other prior to their independent investigation by a third party, the investigators have to rely on circumstantial evidence and to resort to the case history method in their investigation. It is only when the parties have not met, that controlled tests can be administered to the subject and all the possible variables examined. Till such cases are reported, we have to depend on circumstantial evidence and base our inquiries on the retrospective data.

.

STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES
SALIMPUR*

STATEMENTS OF THE WITNESSES RECORDED IN
SALIMPUR VILLAGE, TEHSIL WEIR, DISTRICT
BHARATPUR.

The statement of Shri Brij Mohan S/o Shri Pancha; age 73 years, village—Salimpur (Witness No. 1—S. W)

(Shri Brij Mohan is not related to the family of the Subject (Prabhu) He is not the Primary Witness but his statement has been recorded in order to know the extent of convergence between his statement and that of other witnesses He is not a self assuming person He is forgetful too He confirmed that Prabhu recognised Ghure, the son of Hurbux).

Prabhu was quite a child when he began to speak of his previous life One day he said to his mother, "Mother, you do not cook bread as nicely as my former mother did" His mother simply ignored his remark. After a few days he again complained to his mother of the pain in his knee and said, "I feel pain in my knee I was deer in my second birth. A hunter hit the bullet in my knee as a result of which I died instantaneously Previous to that I was Hurbux Brahman of the village Hathori I have taken my third birth here in Salimpur" These sentences startled the members of the family and the news immediately came to be known to the villagers Because of the small population in this village, every minor happening in anyone's house here is known to all the villagers in no time

The boy also said that his beard caught fire when he was performing the ritual of holi burning When he gave out these

* Unless otherwise stated, the village Salimpur means, Salimpur Khurd

particulars, the Tehsildar of Weir, who was a Muslim and known as the Nawab, at the instance of Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur, came here to verify the statements of the boy. The boy was taken to Hathori. There he is said to have recognised the son of Hurbux and also pointed out the place where Hurbux used to fasten his buffaloes.

He died at the age of about 3 or 4 years because of diarrhoea. He spoke of Hathori for about 2 to 4 months.

Q. Did everything happen in your presence ?

A. No. I was not present. I simply heard from my friends.

Q. Who came to your village to take the boy to Bharatpur ? Was he a Hindu or a Muslim ?

A. A Muslim Tehsildar of Weir came to our village to take the boy to Bharatpur. He was known as 'Nawab Sahib'.

Q. Do people of Salimpur and Hathori meet at Bhusawar ?

A. Yes. Bhusawar is a market-place for the people of both these villages. Often people of both the villages meet there.

Q. Was Shri Khairati in the habit of fabricating cases like this ?

A. No. He was not given to such habits.

Q. Did Khairati ever visit Hathori before the incident took place ?

A. I do not know.

Q. Did Ghure visit Salimpur before Prabhu started speaking about his previous life and was Ghure recognized by the boy ?

A. I did not see Ghure before the incident had taken place. However he used to come often with gifts.

for Prabhu. He continued to come to Salimpur even after the death of Prabhu. He was last seen some five years ago

Statement of Shri Mangal Ram Sharma S/o Shri Girdhari; age—50 years (nephew of Prabhu and cousin of Brij Mohan) Village Salimpur, (Witness No 3. P. W.).

(Shri Mangal Ram was the playmate of Prabhu though he was older than Prabhu. He could not recollect the names of the persons connected with the case but could remember the incidents)

When Prabhu attained the age of about two years, he, one night, cried, "Oh ! How my children might be !" When asked as to how he talked in that fashion, he said, "I am a Brahman of Hathori. I have two sons—Latur and Ghanshyam" Ghanshyam was perhaps the another name of Ghure. Both these persons are now dead. Ghure died in Bhone, a village 7 miles from Salimpur on the Bhusawar—Weir route

Again one day the boy said to his mother Smt Suraj Kaur, "My children might be in trouble" Then I asked him, "What are you talking of?" The news then spread among the villagers. I told the villagers not to talk much to the boy about this matter because he might become nervous. Though he was quite younger to me in age, he was my uncle

First, Latur, the son of Hurbux came here alone riding on a horse back. He was asked to sit. Khairatji sent for the 'Hukka'. Prabhu came out of the house with his mother. He was asked, "Who is this gentleman?" He spontaneously said that he was his elder son. Prabhu told about many things to Latur. Latur had dinner with Khairatji. Then he returned to Hathori. Latur had brought some gifts with him.

A few weeks later, a car came here and the boy was taken to the Maharaja of Bharatpur. Maharaja Kishan Singh and Foydar Bhagwat Singh took the boy to Hathori. There

he is said to have recognised his house and the route to it. He also pointed out the place in the stable where he had buried rupees forty. He also recognised the two tamarind trees.

Shri Khairatji (the father of Prabhu) had a previous acquaintance with Latur and therefore when Latur came over here, Shri Khairatji asked him as to how he came. Shri Khairatji was a famous man known for his religious discourses and hence he had contacts with many persons. Shri Khairatji asked the boy to recognise Latur and he at once said, "He is my son". Shri Khairatji never took Prabhu with him to any place though he often used to go to many villages for giving discourse on 'Rukmani Mangal'. Prabhu was about four years old when he died.

Q. Who came to the house of Shri Khairatji? Was he Gbure or Latur?

A. Probably Latur.

Q. What were you doing at that time?

A. I was playing near the house of Shri Khairatji.

Q. What did you see then? Describe the situation.

A. Shri Khairatji was sitting on a cot outside his house. Latur came on horse back. He alighted from his horse. He was then asked by Shri Khairatji to sit by his side. Shri Khairatji had a previous acquaintance with Latur. He then sent for Prabhu who was inside the house. When Prabhu came out, Shri Khairatji asked him pointing to Latur, "Who is he?" Prabhu at once said, "He is my elder son". Saying this he began to weep and embraced Latur.

Q. Did Khairatji ask Prabhu to recognise the son of Hurbux by saying, "Do you know this man, the son of Hurbux?"

A. I can distinctly remember that Khairatji simply pointed towards the person and asked Prabhu to recognize him. On this, Prabhu gave the name of

the man which I do not remember now. Answer of the boy made Khairatiji and others happy.

Q Are you sure it was Latur who came to your village ?

A I am not sure about the name but I remember the incident

Q Did Latur come to your village previously ?

A I did not see him previously But afterwards he used to come here occasionally.

Statement of Shri Radha Krishna S/o Shri Durga Brahman;
age—61 years, village—Salimpur, Profession—Cultivation
(nephew of Prabhu) (Witness No 2-P W)

(Shri Radha Krishna is of forgetful nature Since the incident is very old, he remembers the major factors only and not the details He is primary witness and narrates the incident as he remembers it)

At the age of about one and half years Prabhu began to speak One day he murmured, "My son might be in trouble". I atonce asked him, "Which son ?" Upon which he said, "I have two sons and also a wife at Hathori" My age at that time was about 20 years I asked him about many items and he told me all correct

The news spread immediately and the people of Hathori also came to know of it. Hurbux's son came here and wept bitterly He was seated here and the boy recognised him of his own accord without getting any hint from any person about them

Thereafter, Foudar Bhagwat Singh of Hathori came here with Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur. I do not remember the names of the sons of Hurbux who came here as the case is a very old one I did not go to Hathori with the boy. The boy was taken to Hathori by the Tehsildar He was accompanied by his father Shri Khairati and his elder brother Shri Bala Ram who died long ago

I was present when the son of Prabhu came here. He came here alone Prabhu atonce said, "He is my son". He also spoke his name which I do not remember, perhaps it was Latur who is now dead. However, I can recollect the event of coming of the son of Hurbux and his recognition by Prabhu

Q. How vividly do you remember the incident chronologically ?

A. I do not remember the minor details of the case but I have stated above what I still remember

Q Did Prabhu recognize Ghure ?

A. Yes I was sitting at a hearing distance from the house of Prabhu Shri Khairati was sitting on a cot Prabhu was inside the house when Ghure came here. I did not know him Shri Khairati called Prabhu who, when came out, immediately recognised Ghure and said, "He is my son". Shri Khairati simply said, "Do you know, who is he ?"

Q. Did Ghure ever come to your village previously ?

A No. So far as I know he did not come But when Prabhu recognised him, he came twice or thrice to this place and brought fruits for Prabhu and continued to visit even after the death of Prabhu

Q. Was there any exchange between the family of Prabhu and that of Hurbux ?

A Not necessarily. I did not see any member of Hurbux's family in my village prior to the incident Shri Khairati's circle was wide He was known to many persons So he might be knowing some persons in Hathori also

Q Did Prabhu go to Hathori previously ?

A. To my knowledge he did not go. But I can't say definitely.

Q Do you think Shri Khazratî was given to the tendency of fabricating such cases ?

A I don't think so.

Q Do you think Smt Harpyari, daughter of Fouydar Narain of your village, who was married to fouydar Ishar of Hathori, had carried the news to Hathori ?

A No No Harpyari was not even born at that time. She is hardly 30 years old and the case is more than 40 years old.

Statement of Shri Vishnu Dutt Sharma S/O Shri Ram-Swaroop Sharma age-23 years profession service (Instructor in Panchayati Raj Training Centre, Bilaspur); interviewed at Sahmpur (Nephew of Prabhu) witness No. 4-S.W)

Shri Vishnu Dutt is a young and educated person. When we were going to Sahmpur, he met us along with his father Shri Ram Swaroop at the Choukarnada Bus Stand. We took both of them with us and reached Sahmpur. He helped us in arranging interviews with the witnesses individually. He is the secondary witness who heard the story from others. He co-operated with us fully in our inquiry about the case and about the family of Shri Khazratî. It was mainly because of him that our Sahmpur part of the investigation could be conducted conveniently.*

When I was reading in class VI, I heard the story of my uncle Prabhu from my uncle Shri Balaran, who used to tell us many interesting stories. He told me, that one night it was raining and Prabhu was sleeping with his mother. All of a sudden he groaned, "How my children might be doing!" He was asked as to what children he was speaking of. He then said, "My children are in Hathori." He also said that sometimes he felt pain in his leg. He was a deer in his second birth and previous to that he was Hurbux Brahmin of Hathori. A hunter

*Shri Vishnu Dutt Sharma and his father were left at a distance from their house and were requested not to meet us before they were sent for and they agreed to do so.

fired bullet which hit his knee as a result of which he died. Then it is said that he was taken to the Maharaja of Bharatpur. The boy was pleased to see the golden chain around the neck of the Maharaja and expressed his desire to have it. The Maharaja then promised him to get another similar chain minted for him.

After a couple of days the boy was taken to Hathori where, it is said, he pointed out the spot in the stable where he had buried rupees forty and also the name of the wells. When Prabhu died, the Maharaja was very much grieved to hear the sad news.

Statement of Shri Kajorilal Sharma s/o Shri Ram Kumar Sharma; age—50 years; Village—Salimpur; profession—cultivation (Witness No 5—P.W.).

(Shri Kajorilal is in distant relationship with Shri Ram Swaroop S/o Shri Khairati. He is the primary witness who confirms the recognition of Ghure, the son of Hurbux. He is a bit forgetful of the whole story but whatever he remembers, he appears to have stated sincerely.)

One night while in mild sleep, Prabhu began to murmur and then he began to weep. His mother Smt Suraj Kaur alias Gulab Kaur said to him, "My son, why do you weep?" He then replied that his children might be in trouble. The mother lulled him to sleep. Next morning she asked him why he was speaking of his family. Thereupon he said, "My sons are in Hathori." "Do you have children?" asked his father. "Yes", replied the boy, "I have two sons—one Ghure and the other's name I do not remember."

Then the news of this incident spread among the villagers. Smt Harpyari daughter of Foudar Naram of this village was married to Foudar Ishar of Hathori. She talked in Hathori about this incident.¹ Having come to know about Prabhu's claiming to be Hurbux of Hathori, Ghure, the elder son of

1 This statement has been contradicted by other witnesses.

Hurbux came over here. I was then about 10 years old. I was sitting at the house of Shri Khairati when Ghure came here. Prabhu recognised Ghure and began to weep as soon as he saw him. He particularly mentioned his name without getting any hint from any person here. Ghure returned to Hathori and told his family and other villagers about the incident.

Thereafter, Foydar Bhagwat Singh of Hathori came to this place on being directed by the Maharaja of Bharatpur. Prabhu was sent for. When he came, he again began to weep before Foydar Bhagwat Singh. He was then taken to the Maharaja Sahib who ordered the Tehsildar of Weir to investigate the case. The Tehsildar then took the boy to Hathori. There, it is said, he recognised his house and some persons of that village. He is also said to have pointed out the exact spot where he said he had buried rupees forty.

Q Describe the scene you saw when Ghure came to your village.

A I was playing with other boys at a short distance from the house of Shri Khairati. When Ghure came here, we stopped playing and began to see him as he was a stranger to us. He went to the house of Shri Khairati who was sitting on a cot on the raised platform outside his house. Shri Khairati received him cordially and asked him the reason of his visit. Ghure said that he had come simply to see the child Prabhu. Prabhu was then called for from inside the house. He came out along with his mother. Shri Khairati asked him to recognise the stranger. He recognised him as his elder son and also mentioned his name.

Q Was Ghure not a stranger to Shri Khairati ?

A Probably not because he at once asked him, "How did you come ?"

Q Did Foujdar Bhagwat Singh come here? Were you present?

A. I was not present. I simply heard from others. I remember only of Ghure's coming over here.

Q. Was there any exchange between both the parties previously?

A. As far as I know, I don't think so.

Q. Do you think it was Smt Harpyari of your village who might have carried the news to Hathori?

A. Yes, I do think like that.

Q What was her age at that time?

A. I do not know exactly. She was a young woman.

Statement of Shri Dharam Singh s/o Shri Sonpal; age-45 years, caste-Jat; village-Salimpur. (Witness No 6 S W.)

(Shri Dharam Singh was the playmate of Prabhu. As he was also a child, he does not remember the incident in detail. He, however, heard about the whole case from his fellow beings. Though he was very close to Prabhu, yet Prabhu never recalled any incident of his alleged previous life before him.)

I was the playmate of Prabhu. I was of his age when the incident took place. I do not remember the details of the case as I was a child. Prabhu never mentioned to me about his previous life and his sons prior to his son's coming to this place. He became very much pleased to see his son here and gave me berries brought by Ghure for him.

I heard from my parents that Prabhu used to say that he belonged to Hathori and that his name was Hurbux. He had two sons and two daughters. The Maharaja of Bharatpur being interested in this case of rebirth, ordered the Tehsildar of Weir to conduct an inquiry of the case. Consequently, Prabhu was produced before the Maharaja who asked him some

questions to which, it is said, he replied correctly. He was then taken to Hathori where, I was told, he recognised his house and the important persons of that village.

Q Do you remember the incident in detail ?

A No I remember only one thing that Prabhu gave me berries because he was very happy to see his son in our village.

Q Who was Smt Harpyari ? Do you know anything about her ?

A No, I don't know

Statement of Shri Roop Singh s/o Ghenda Ram; age—73 Years; Lamberdar; village—Salimpur. (Witness No. 7 S. W.).

(Shri Roop Singh is the neighbour of Ram Swaroop He is forgetful of the events of the case and does not recall fully what had happened in this case Being quite an old fellow his memory is sharply declining)

The boy used to tell about Hathori. He also told his name which I do not remember. I was informed that he recalled that in the marriage of one of his daughters he accepted money from the family of bride-groom Khairati of this village used to give religious discourse at distant places, so he had wide acquaintance. When the news of this incident spread out, a muslim *Thanedar* (Incharge of Police Station) of Bhusawar came to this village. He was having a long beard. On seeing him Prabhu said, "I also had a long beard which caught fire when I was burning the fire on the occasion of Holi."

I do not remember whether the boy was taken to Hathori at all. I am also not sure whether the Tehsildar of Weir came to this village. At that time the Tehsildar of Weir was a Muslim fellow who was popular by his nick-name—Nawab

Q Who came to your village ? Was he Incharge, Police Station, Bhusawar or Tehsildar of Weir ?

1. I do not exactly remember This is a very old case. This much I remember that the fellow who came to our village was having beard and when Prabhu saw him, he said that he was also having a long beard in his previous life

Q. Do you have any knowledge of a lady named Harpyari in your village who was married at Hathori ?

A. I do not know as such.

Statement of Shri Ram Swaroop s/o Khairati Lal Brahman; age—55 years; Sarpanch of the village Salimpur. (Witness No. 8—S W.).

(Shri Ram Swaroop is a somewhat educated man who is the Sarpanch of the village of Salimpur. He is the elder brother of Prabhu whose case is under study. He was previously interviewed in the month of December, 1963 He was interviewed for the second time in Salimpur on 6th November, 1964. He is an intelligent and a smart fellow Whatever statement he has given he is confident of the same)

First statement recorded on 25th December, 1963. (at Bhusawar) :—(Tape recorded)

Prabhu was my younger brother. He was born on Magh Sudi 2nd Samvat 1975 (corresponding to Sunday, 2nd February, 1919) He began to speak at the age of one and half years. One night while in sleep he murmured, "How my children might be doing". My mother who was sleeping by his side, exclaimed, "What children ?" He told her that he wanted to know about his former children. On being asked, "How many children did you have ?", he said, "Four—two sons and two daughters, Ghure and Shyam Lal were my sons and Kokila and Bhouti were my daughters" He also said that he had accepted some money from the party of Kherli for the marriage of his elder daughter Kokila while in the marriage of his younger daughter Bhouti he did not

He was then asked to tell about his previous life. Whereupon he said that his name was Hurbux and that he belonged to Hathori. When Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur came to know of this incident, he sent the Tehsildar of Weir (who was Muslim by religion) for the investigation of the case. First Prabhu was taken to the Maharaja and then to Hathori where he was asked to recognise the items he had recalled.

There he recognised his house, and Kunti Jat whom he narrated his dispute with him regarding the tamarind tree in Hathori. He also pointed out the 'Kund' (pond) where, he said he used to take bath. He also then located the spot where he had buried rupees one hundred. On digging the particular spot the amount of rupees one hundred was actually found. The Tehsildar Weir and Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh were present.

Prabhu one day said to my mother, "Mother, some time I feel pain in my knee". When asked, "Why?" he replied that he possessed the body of a deer after giving up the body of Hurbux. "A hunter chased me and I was shot dead. The bullet passed through my knee and after suffering acute pain in my knee for a short time, I breathed my last".

Q. Was there any mark on his knee?

A. No. But, however, there was a small scar on the right side of his waist which was somewhat blackish.

Q. Did any member of your family know the family of Hurbux previously?

A. No.

Q. Is there any surviving person in Hathori who has the knowledge of this incident?

A. Yes. Bhagwat Singh is still in Hathori.

8. Second statement recorded on 6th November, 1964

Prabhu was my younger brother. In Samvat 1977 (1920 AD) he began to speak. He was hardly 13 months old at that time. He never spoke in a childlike language.

The case was that one night when it was raining, Prabhu (about 3 or 4 years old) while in sleep, murmured 'Oh Ram ! How my children might be doing !' My mother who was sleeping by his side asked him to sleep as other children were also sleeping. Thereupon he said that he had his own children, but my mother lulled him to sleep without paying any heed to what he had said in a low voice. Then after a month or two at night he repeated the same sentence to Daulat Ram (the son of my uncle) upon which Daulat Ram asked him, "What children do you mean ?" Then our desire to ask him grew more intense. Upon our asking about his name, place etc, he said, "My name is Hurbux. I belong to Hathori" He also told us that he had two sons and two daughters Ghure and Shyamlal were the names of his sons as he told us and Kokila and Bhouti were his daughters. He further pointed out that Kokila—his elder daughter—was married to Har Bhajan of village Kherli His younger daughter Bhouti was married to Vallabh of village Navar In the marriage of his elder daughter he accepted some money from the family of the boy but in the marriage of his younger daughter he did not There might be some thing wrong with the boy and for that Hurbux might have taken money from the other side. Prabhu further told us that he had beard which caught fire when he was performing the ritual of Holi burning He told my mother one day that he felt some pain in his knee occasionally When asked, "Why ?" he said that he was having the body of a deer before taking his birth in our family He further said that a hunter had fired a bullet at him which hit his knee and after suffering severe pain for sometime, he died

The topic of this incident was discussed by some people at Bhusawar Bhusawar is a *mandi* and the people of Hathori and Salimpur often meet there while marketing Thus the news spread and somehow reached Hathori.

When the news reached Hathori, Ghure, the elder son of Hurbux came to this village He was instantaneously recognised by Prabhu He then returned to Hathori Thereafter, Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur when heard about this

incident, ordered the boy to be brought before him. He was interested in such cases of rebirth. It was Foudar Bhagwat Singh who first informed the Maharaja about this incident. The boy was taken to Bharatpur where he was interviewed by the Maharaja Raja Kishan Singh who was Chief of Staff at the palace of the Maharaja, took the boy and tossed him into the air, upon which he said to him "You shall be punished by the Maharaja." This prediction came out to be true. Raja Kishan Singh was exiled from the State. Then, as directed by the Maharaja, the boy was taken to Hathori by the Tehsildar of Weir who was also having a beard. I did not accompany the boy. He was taken in a bullock cart. There at Hathori, it is said, he recognised Foudar Bhagwat Singh son of Capt. Kanchan Singh. When he saw Bhagwat Singh, he said, "You are the son of Capt. Kanchan Singh. I used to fondle you in my lap." Thereupon Bhagwat Singh said, "Oh! Are you Hurbux?" Bhagwat Singh was already knowing this incident because he had come over to this place previously.

I heard that a crowd had gathered there at Hathori when he reached there. He was then left to lead the way to his house and recognised it. At one place he stopped, stood amazed, hesitated, looked around, remembered and then proceeded further and then he reached his house. The house was in the dilapidated condition. There he is said to have pointed out the place in the stable where he had buried rupees forty. The particular spot he pointed out, was immediately ordered by the Tehsildar to be dug. Rupees forty were found there on digging the place.

Then Khunti Jat of Hathori asked him, "Was there anything in common between us?" Prabhu atonce said that he was his partner in the tamarind tree. Formerly, Khunti Jat had a quarrel with Ghure the son of Hurbux over that tamarind tree but when Prabhu told him that the tree belonged to him exclusively and the right should be transferred to Ghure, his instruction was carried out and the right over that tree was transferred to Ghure.

Prabhu died on 13th of Bhadon in Samvat 1979* on account of diarrhoea at the age of 3 or 4 year

Q. Was there any scar on Prabhu's knee ?

A. No, there was no mark of a bullet on his knee. But there was a scar on his waist.

Q. Do you know Smt. Harpyari D/o Foujdar Narain of your village ? Was it she who might have communicated the news to the people of Hathori ?

A. The point that Harpyari carried the news to Hathori, is quite wrong because she was not even born at that time. Her present age is 29 years only.

Q. Do people of Hathori and Salimpur often meet at Bhusawar ?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Prabhu recognise Ghure in your presence ?

A. No, I was not present when Prabhu recognised him

Statement of Smt. Basanti** w/o Chiranji; age—70 years; village—Salimpur (Witness No 9—S W.)

I heard the entire story from the mother of Prabhu. She told me that the boy 'one night began to murmur, "How my children might be doing" Thereupon he was asked as to whom

*Ram Swaroop was not sure about Prabhu's exact date of death. He could not tell whether it was Bhadon Badi or Sudi 13 of Samvat 1979. He simply informed the investigators that Prabhu died on 13th of Bhadon in Samvat 1979. If it was Bhadon Badi 13 the corresponding English date was Sunday 20th August 1922 if it was Bhadon Sudi 13, the corresponding English date was Monday, 4th September, 1922. This shows that Prabhu's date of death given by Ram Swaroop is wrong because according to the report of Dr Shyam Sunderlal, Prabhu was examined at the house of his father in the month of March, 1923.

**The investigators tried to question her but she was hesitant to say anything beyond what she had stated in her statement,

he meant. Then he said that he was Hurbux Brahman of Hathori. He had children and wife. The rumour of this incident spread out and the Maharaja of Bharatpur also came to know of it. It was perhaps Smt. Harpyari D/o Foujdar Naram of our village who might have carried the news to Hathori. She was married to Foujdar Ishar of Hathori. He sent for the boy and the boy was taken to his palace. Then some State official took the boy to Hathori where he was reported to have recognised his house and the members of his family. He also said that he had a pair of bullocks in his previous life.

The son of Hurbux also came to this village prior to the State official and it is said, the boy recognised him.

HATHORI

Statement of Pandit Johari Lal Sharma s/o Ramet Lal Sharma of village Hathori Tehsil Weir, District Bharatpur; profession—Cultivation of land Age—55 years (Witness No 10 —P W)

(Pandit Johari Lal Sharma is the Primary Witness in this case. He was himself present at the scene when Prabhu was brought to Hathori by the Tehsildar of Weir in the year 1923. He was about 14 years old at that time and could read and understand Sanskrit. At present he is considered Sanskrit-scholar and reckoned as a Pandit of great repute in the village community. His ecananic position is sound as he has extensive land for cultivation. The recognition tests were given by the Tehsildar to the boy in his presence. He is fully confident of all the incidents that happened before him and he has given them in detail in his statements. He does not seem to be a man in the habit of exaggerating facts. He describes all the events vividly by showing certain gestures appropriate to those that took place at the time when Prabhu was brought to the village. Prabhu was not for him a different man but Hurbux in Prabhu's body.)

In the year 1923, when Prabhu son of Khairati of the village Sahampur was brought to this place (Hathori). I was present and all the incidents happened before me. My age at that time was probably 13 or 14 years. Chowdhari Ram Swaroop, Tehsildar, brought the boy to our place. He was sent by the Maharaja of Bharatpur to this place perhaps as he was Jat by caste and secondly, he often used to go to the palace of the Maharaja. So, because of these two reasons the Maharaja might have sent him to investigate the case instead of the Nawab, who was that time the Tehsildar of Weir.

The Tehsildar and the boy reached here in the evening and stayed at the house of Lumberdar Goverdhan Singh which is at the outskirts of the village and took meals there. Everything was kept secret at that time. Next morning important persons of the village were called for and they were made to sit in a circular row. The boy recognised* spontaneously Rampal Jat and said, "You are Rampal Jat; you were my *Yajman*". Then he turned to *Faujdar* Swaroop who was sitting next to Rampal Jat and at once said to him without getting any hint from any person, "You are *Faujdar* Swaroop. Then he recognised Sampat, the grocer of our village and called him by name.

Next morning the boy was asked to recognise his house. He said, "There is a *Haveli* in the fortress in which there are several houses. My house is one of them. He was then asked to go ahead and find out his house. That fortress is now in ruins. The boy entered the gate of the *Haveli*. There was the house of Rampal Jat near the entrance. The boy was asked "Whose house is this?" He at once replied, "This is the house of Rampal Jat." He correctly pointed out the house of Rampal Jat. The boy also said that many of the houses of his *Yajmans* in the *Haveli* belonged to him. He then straightway went to the house of Hurbux and said, "This is my house." The house was in the dilapidated condition. He located the house of Hurbux correctly without anyone's assistance.

*The witness got up from his seat and began to perform actions and make specific gestures to show the manner in which the boy (Prabhu) behaved with the villagers.

Shri Govind Brahmin was standing near the house of Hurbux. The boy spontaneously and to the utter surprise of bystanders shouted, "Oh ! Shri Govind ? Do you remember, we had a quarrel over the house and one day you came out with a sword and I threw your sword away ?" The very moment Shiv Naram, the younger brother of Shri Govind reached there and the boy exclaimed, "Why, Shiv Naram ! Did a quarrel between Shri Govind and I not take place ?" To this Shiv Naram agreed that the quarrel did take place.

The boy then pointed out that he had buried rupees five at the place where his buffalo was tied. This money he got as 'Dakshina' from some one. The particular spot he pointed at, was immediately ordered by the Tehsildar to be dug. When the place was dug out a small earthen pot containing rupees five was actually found there.

He also recognised two tamarind trees. He said both these trees belonged to him. About these tamarind trees, Shri Govind and Shiv Naram had quarrel with Ghure, the elder son of Hurbux and they claimed that these trees actually belonged to them and not to Hurbux or his family. But the boy Prabhu said emphatically at that time that those trees exclusively belonged to him and that neither Shri Govind nor Shiv Naram had any right thereto at all, and on this account those gentlemen gave up the quarrel with Ghure and gave him the exclusive right to those trees.

Upon being asked as to who built the fortress, the boy said, "*Foydar* Guman Singh. There is a temple of *Hanumany* in the fortress and also a tank. A *Babaji* used to graze the cow there."

Hurbux got his both the daughters married. Kokila, his elder daughter, was married according to the Hindu rites and in the marriage of the younger daughter Bhouti, he accepted money from the bridegroom's family which belonged to Navar, Tehsil Weir. I do not remember the name of the husband of Kokila but this much I know that she was married at Kherli. Bhouti was married to Vallabh of Navar.

Hurbux used to clean paths for the villagers by removing the undesired and stumbling stones from the path.

Prabhu told Shri Govind that Moola Jat had fallen into the Kankarwala well and that he had saved his life, He also told him that Dharam Singh Jat of village Ghantri was his *Yajman*

Prabhu also told the gathering that during the famine in the year 1934, he could survive by taking only *Gular*, a fruit of the banyan tree

Gaura was the wife of Hurbux We particularly noted that the boy was smiling and laughing intermittently while recognising persons and things here He also recognised Foudar Dharam Singh

As far as I remember, Khairati of Salimpur, the father of Prabhu used to come here occasionally to give us religious discourse and to sing *Katha*

Hurbux Dube of village Bhagwanpur was the nephew of Pandit Haret Dubey of Hathori Brahman Haret (my great uncle and not the brother of Hurbux) used to go to his maternal uncle in Bhagwanpur village, Khairatilal also used to go to that village Both often met at Bhagwanpur and acquaintance developed between them So because of him Khairatilal used to come to our village Hathori Khairatilal gave a religious discourse on 'Rukmani Mangal' in our village I heard that the first occasion on which Prabhu recalled his previous life, was the day when it was drizzling and his mother was churning butter and he said to her, "My mother used to give me much Ghee".

Q How do you say that Tehsildar Ram Swaroop often used to go to the Maharaja of Bharatpur ?

A I simply heard so

Q. Did you immediately come to know of the Tehsildar's staying with Lumberdar Goverdhan Singh of your village ?

A. No. We all came to know this the next morning when the boy was led to recognise his house and the leading persons of our village.

Q. Did Prabhu recognise you at Hathori ?

A. I was quite a small boy at that time.

Q. What was the name of the younger daughter of Hurbux—Bhouth or Bhohi ?

A. Bhouth.

Q. Was there any exchange between the family of Hurbux and that of Khirwati of Salmipur ?

A. There was no direct exchange so to say. But Khirwati Lal being known for his religious discourses used to visit this place sometime.

Q. Did you ever see him bringing Prabhu with him to your village ?

A. No. Nor did I hear from anyone as such.

Q. What was the name of the Tehsildar who came to your village with the boy ?

A. Chowdhari Ram Swaroop.

Q. Was there any Muslim Tehsildar also who visited your village ?

A. No.

Q. Can you tell us whether the wife of Hurbux was nick-named "Ganjo" ?

A. I cannot say.

Note—Pandit Johari Lal while giving his statement gave us an impression as if the whole situation and the incident had actually come before his vision and he was talking in the manner as if the incident took place only a few days back. Looking to the vivid description he was giving of the whole situation, we put him certain questions and also tried to verify from him the contents of the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal. He pointed out certain corrections to be made in the report and also gave out greater details about some items which were lacking in the report. The corrections he pointed out have been mentioned while discussing the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal.

Q. How many sons did Hurbux have ?

A. Two—Ghure and Khatiya.

Q. Did Hurbux die before the death of his father ?

A. No. He died after his father's death.

Q. Can you tell us whether Moola Jat of your village ever fell into the well of Hurbux and that Hurbux saved his life ?

A. Yes, I did hear about this incident.

Q. Is there any legend connected with the serpent in the fortress of your village ?

A. Yes. There is a legend connected with the serpent in the fortress. In a particular well in the fortress, the riches are buried. There is a condition that whosoever wishes to take out the buried wealth, would have to sacrifice his son and his daughter-in-law (husband and wife). Once it so happened that a Foujdar named Ante begao to remove some of the stones from that well with the hope of getting the buried wealth. Hardly could he remove a few stones when he was overawed by the idea of fear. A sense of fear pervaded him that he might not be put to any harm and so he ran away.

Q. Can you inform us about the dates of birth and death of Hurbux ?

A. I do not remember but I may suggest you that the date of birth of Hurbux can be obtained from Shri Shankerlal 'Jaga' who lives at Mohallah Jat-ki-Sarai, Hindaun (District Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan) and his date of death from Devkinandan Shiv Shanker 'Lapsia' of Shoron (U. P.) Hurbux's *Gangaguru*.

Q. Are you fully confident of all that you have described in your statement ?

A. Yes

Statement of Chaudhari Bhagwat Singh village—Hathori,
Tehsil—Weir, District—Bharatpur (Witness No 11—P.W.)

(Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh is also one of the main persons associated with this case. He was Aid de Camp to Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur during the year 1922-23 when the incident took place. Though he is about 65 years old, his memory is sharp and he looks still quite robust and smart. He was present at the time when the boy Prabhu was brought to Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur. He is fully confident of what he says. He was the person who informed the Maharaja about the case. He was very anxious to know the statements of other witnesses and was insisting upon the same being read out. He was particularly interested in knowing what Johari Lal had said.)

First statement sent by post on 14th February, 1964.

1

Near about 42-43 years ago I came to know that Brahmin Hurbux of my village was reborn in a brahmin family in Salimpur. I reported the case to Maharaja Kishan Singh. The Maharaja interviewed the boy. He asked his name whereupon he replied, "Which name you want to know—my present name is Prabhu but I was Hurbux in my previous life." On being asked to tell the name of his village, he said, "My village is Salimpur and Hathori is the village of my previous life." The Maharaja asked him to give some details of Hathori also. Prabhu pointed out the fortress and a temple of Hanumanji inside the fortress. He also spoke the names of some wells and said that he knew his house also. He further said that he had one son and two daughters and knew their names as well.

The Maharaja ordered the Tehsildar* to take the boy to Hathori and to see whether he could recognise anything at all

*In his letter of March 27, 1964, Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh stated that it was Chowdhari Ram Swaroop and not a muslim Tehsildar who was ordered by the Maharaja of Bharatpur to take the boy to Hathori. He was Tehsildar at some Tehsil other than Weir.

Regarding the particulars about Chowdhari Rewat Singh, he stated that he was his younger brother who lived at Bharatpur in Mohalla Gopalgarh.

The Tehsildar took him to Hathori. At Hathori, Prabhu showed the fortress and also pointed out the temple of Hanumanji inside the fortress. He recognised two-three elderly persons of the village and identified them with their respective names. Prabhu reached his house and recognised his son from a distance and said that his name was Ghure. After that the Tehsildar brought him back to Bharatpur and narrated the whole story to the Maharaja. At Bharatpur the Maharaja's mother called the boy and gave him some clothes etc. From Bharatpur present father took him back to Salimpur.

Second statement of Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh recorded on 7th November, 1964 at Hathori.

II

The news reached here that Hurbux of our village had taken rebirth at Salimpur village. Then Ghure, the elder son of Hurbux went to Salimpur. The boy (Prabhu) said as soon as he saw Ghure, "He is my son". Then he said that he was Hurbux of the village Hathori and that he had two daughters.

Next day, while I was dining with the Maharaja, I talked about this incident and told the Maharaja that a Brahman of my village had taken rebirth at Salimpur village. The Maharaja himself was very much interested in such cases. He immediately ordered Chowdhari Ram Swaroop, the Tehsildar of Weir to present the boy before him and investigate the case.

Prabhu was brought before the Maharaja. The boy was bewildered to see the glamour and glittering of the palace. He was looking hither and thither. First, the boy was made to sit in the drawing room and was given some toys to play with so that he might settle down and open up for questioning. The Maharaja asked him, "What is your name? Which village to you belong?" The boy promptly begged, "Of which birth of mine are you talking, Sir? Do you mean the name of my previous birth or of the present?" The Maharaja said, "Tell me of your previous birth as well as of the present one." Then the boy said humbly, "In my previous birth I was called

Hurbux and I belonged to the village Hathori and in my present birth, I am called by the name of Prabhu and I belong to Salimpur village "

Thereafter, the boy again became busy in playing with toys he was given. When the boy was brought to the palace, I was asked by the Maharaja to hide and I did so. After some-time he beaoned me to come to the scene. I went to him and he asked the boy to recognise me. The boy spontaneously recognised me and said, "He is the son of my *Yajman*." The Maharaja then asked him, "Do you know Hathori? If you know it then describe the place." "Yes", came forth the reply, "There is a fortress and a pond in Hathori. The gate of my house is in the East."

Then the Maharaja ordered the boy to be taken to Hathori for recognition test. The Tehsildar brought him here but I was not present, so I cannot say what items did the boy recognise here. I was told by the Tehsildar that he straightway went to the house of Hurbux and said, "This is my house." He is also said to have pointed out the spot where Hurbux had buried rupees five and on digging the place the amount was actually found buried.

Q How did the news reach you and your village Hathori?

A There was rumour amongst villagers of Hathori about the incident.

Q Did you ask Ghure whether he was recognised by Prabhu?

A No. I did not.

Q Who was the Tehsildar of Weir at that time? Did he come to Hathori to investigate the case?

A Chowdhary Ram Swaroop was the Tehsildar of Weir. He came to our village to investigate the case, but at that time I was not present.

Q Did you enquire from him afterwards about the specific recognitions made by Prabhu in Hathori ?

A Yes The Tehsildar informed me that the boy recognised his house and also pointed out the place where Hurbux had buried a small sum of money and some people of the village

Q Was there any Muslim Tehsildar who investigated the case at the instance of the Maharaja of Bharatpur ?

A Previously a *Nawab* Tehsildar was at Weir but he was retired by the time the case came to the notice of the Maharaja. After his retirement Chowdhari Ram Swaroop Tehsildar was posted at Weir

Q Did the boy recognise Nathi, the Chief Coachman of the Maharaja at the palace of the Maharaja ?

A I do not perfectly remember

Q. Who was Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal ?

A. I do not know

Q. Did Shri Khairati (the father of Prabhu) often come to Hathori ?

A. Yes, he did come but not so often

Q Can you describe the incident chronologically ?

A. I know of the case only upto the stage when the boy was brought to the Maharaja I did not accompany the boy to Hathori when he was sent for recognition test with the Tehsildar of Weir and hence I can not describe the whole incident chronologically. I have stated what I really know about the case

Statement of Nathi Lal Sharma s/o Galla Ram Sharma;
Village and P O -Hathori; Age-84 years; Profession-Cultivation
(Witness No 12-P W.).

(Nathi Lal, is the heir apparent in the generation of the family of the father of Hurbux. After the death of sons of Hurbux, Nathi Lal got their property since he was the last surviving heir apparent. Ghure did not marry. He (Nathulal) was the Chief

Coachman of the Maharaja of Bharatpur during the year 1922-23. While the Maharaja Kishan Singh was living, the main work of Nathi Lal was to look after his horse. After his death he was given different duties which he did not appreciate and consequently left the job. When the boy was brought to the palace before the Maharaja, he was present there. He is confident of the truth of his statements. He remembers the incident distinctly and recalls the facts vividly. At present, with the profession of cultivation he is also the Priest of the temple of Hanumanji in Hathori. (This is another temple of Hanumanji and not the one which is in the fortress). He was indifferent to the study of the case. Turning to the investigators he said, "Why do you ask questions about the case? Fact is fact. I can confidently say that the boy recognised me")

Hurbux had three brothers—Galla Ram, Chunni Lal and Haret. There is no person named Latur here. I do not remember the date of birth of Hurbux but he died probably in the year *Somvat* 1955 (corresponding to 1898 A D).

In the year 1922-23 I was serving at the Royal palace as the Coachman of Maharaja Kishan Singh of Bharatpur. The boy named Prabhu son of Khairati of Salampur came to the palace, 'Moti Mahal' when ordered to be brought before the Maharaja. By chance, I was present there in the palace. The Maharaja asked the boy to recognise me since he knew I belonged to Hathori. Thereupon he at once recognised me and said, "He is the son of my brother" and then he pronounced my name 'Nathi Lal' correctly. When he pronounced my name, I became confident that he was Hurbux reborn and I gave him one rupee.

When the boy was brought to Hathori for recognition test, I was not present. However, I came to know that he recognised his house, some person there and many other items.

Hurbux had two sons—Ghure (the elder) and Khatiya (the younger) and two daughters—Kokila (the elder) and Bhouti (the younger). He was a land lord. He had a land comprising about 12½ bigas and about 15 or 20 bigas of land was

given to some persons who mortgaged their 'Pattas' with him. All his land has been given to me now as I am the only surviving member in his family. His both the sons are dead

Q. Did Prabhu recognise you at the palace of the Maharaja ?

A. Yes. He spontaneously recognised me and gave out my name also.

Q. Describe in detail the manner in which Prabhu was asked by the Maharaja to recognise you ?

A. A servant came running to me and informed me that the Maharaja wanted me at the palace in his drawing room. I rushed to his room and bowed my head before him in reverence. The Maharaja asked the boy to recognise me. He at once said, "He is the son of my brother."

Q. Did the Maharaja call you by name asking you to appear before Prabhu for recognition test ?

A. No. When I appeared before the Maharaja, I stood silently bowing my head in reverence. The Maharaja said to the boy, 'Well, my boy, do you recognise this man ?' —(pointing towards me). He instantaneously replied, "He is the son of my brother." Whether the Maharaja took my name or not while asking his attendant to produce me before him, I cannot say, but after my reaching the scene, he did not take my name.

Q. How many persons were present when Prabhu was asked to recognise you ?

A. Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh, the Chief of the Staff and about two or three personal attendants of the Maharaja were present at that time.

Q. Where were you and what were you doing when Prabhu was with the Maharaja ? How were you summoned ?

A. I was doing my job in the stable at the palace when a servant came running to me. As has already been

told, I atonce went to the Maharaja and stood silently before him

Q Did you ask any person in Hathori about the items Prabhu had recognised there ?

A I was told by some of my fellow villagers that Prabhu recognised his house, some persons (names I do not remember) and some other items.

Q How many times did you see Prabhu at the palace of the Maharaja previously ?

A Never.

Q Let us know some details of the dispute about the tamarind tree in Hathori ?

A I do not remember *

Q. What were the names of the younger son and the daughter of Hurbux ?

A. Khauja was the younger son and Bhouti, the younger daughter of Hurbux

Q Was there any son of Hurbux named Latur ?

A No

Q Why did you resign from service at the royal palace ?

A For some personal reasons (This witness allowed no further questions saying there was no use speaking about old matters and he had spoken about things about which he knew)

Statement of Mangi Lal s/o Hulas Ram Age—85 years;
Village—Hathori (Witness No 13—P.W)

(Mangi Lal is an old fellow but he remembers the incident that happened about 43 years ago When questioned about the facts of the case, he vividly described them which he saw by himself and denied everything which he did not personally see Hurbux's house is built (now in a dilapidated condition) at an

*It was very clear from his gestures that he was very much annoyed at this question He was trying to discard this point probably due to the fear that the question of partnership might not emerge again After a pause, he said, "It is no use knowing about these old things

elevation and the house of Mangi Lal is by the side of the road to his (Hurbux's) house. There are two alternative roads near the house of Mangi Lal because there the road is divided into two narrow roads. Hurbux's house is at the end of the road on the left side which is almost concealed if looked from the crossing at Mangi Lal's house. The statements of Prabhu as contained in the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal were got checked from Mangi Lal too. The comparative chart containing verification of the statements of Prabhu by Pandit Jahari Lal and Mangi Lal has been given separately.)

The boy (Prabhu) came here with the Tehsildar Ram-Swaroop. I was sitting on the *Chabutar* (raised platform) of my house. Since I did not stand in front of the boy, he did not recognise me. There was a crowd assembled in my village. What I saw was that the boy was leading the path and others were following him. When they passed by my house, I also joined the crowd and went to the house of Hurbux. The boy stopped at the house of Hurbux and said, "This is my house". He also pointed out the exact place where Hurbux used to fasten his buffalo. Hurbux had a long beard. On his turn, he burned the stick on Holi. He had two sons—1. Ghure and 2. Dalgani alias Khatriya and two daughters—Kokila (the elder daughter) who was married to Har Bhajan of Menpura—Kherli and Bhouti (the younger daughter) who was married to Vallabh of Navar. Beyond this I cannot say anything.

Q. Describe the scene you saw when Prabhu was coming towards your house

A. I was sitting on a cot outside my house. What I saw was that a crowd was following a little boy who was leading the people. He reached near my house and then took the road leading to the house of Hurbux. He did not stay at the crossing but took the right path leading to the house of Hurbux. Then I also joined the crowd.

Q. Was the Tehsildar or any other person going ahead of the boy?

- A. No No one was going ahead of the boy. The boy was leading all the people who were following him. He was going leisurely and confidently
-

A J H U

The statement of Rnja Kishan Singh s/o Shri Bhoori Singh; Age—63 years; Occupation—Agriculture; Village—Ajbu, Tehsil—Sewar (Witness No 14 P W)

(Raja Kishan Singh, though 63 years old, is yet a robust fellow. He showed his apathetic attitude to our investigation of the case saying that this case was quite an old enough to be re-investigated now. He was hesitant and forgetful of the events of the case. He was not serious while giving his statement. He was also contacted through correspondence, but he never replied)

When Maharaja Kishan Singh heard this news he called the boy at Bharatpur. I was Chief of the Staff nt that time. The father of the boy brought him to the Maharaja. I was near the Maharaja when he interviewed the boy, but I was engaged in some work. The boy replied that he belonged to Hathori. He had sons, daughters buffaloes etc. Because I was very busy in my work, so I did not pay any attention to that case and that is why I don't remember anything more.

In 1923 Ram Swaroop, Tehsildar of Weir was at Bharatpur and hence he was asked by the Maharaja to investigate the matter.

Q Was Mr Bhagwat Singh also present when the boy was brought before the Maharaja ?

A I do not exactly remember

Q. How did the Maharaja come to know of the incident ?

- A. It was Foudar Bhagwat Singh who communicated the news to him
- Q Can you vividly describe the scene at the palace of the Maharaja when the boy was brought to the Maharaja ? Do you also remember the conversation that took place between the Maharaja and the boy ?
- A. As I was busy with some work, I did not pay much attention to the case.
- Q. Can you tell us whether the boy recognised Nathilal the coachman of the Maharaja at the palace of the Maharaja ?
- A. I am not sure.
- Q. Who was the Tehsildar of Weir at that time ?
- A. Chawdhari Ram Swaroop.
- Q Did a Tehsudar known as 'Nawab' ever remain at Tehsil Weir ?
- A Yes, before the posting of Ram Swaroop at Weir as Tehsildar, a muslim Tehsildar was there at Weir who was known *the Nawab* He was retired and then Ram Swaroop joined at Weir.
- Q Describe the whole incident chronologically ?
- A I do not remember fully and hence I cannot describe the incident chronologically.
-

BHARATPUR

The statement of Chowdhari Rewat Singh s/o Captain Kunchan Singh; Age—58 years; Occupation—Service; Gopalgarh. Bharatpur (Witness No 15 P.W.)

(Chowdhari Rewot Singh is the younger brother of Chowdhari Bhogwat Singh He is the booking-clerk of the Bus stand in Mohallo Gopalgarh in Bharatpur He is the primory witness who was present in Hathori when the boy was taken to

that village He describes the incident vividly and distinctly remembers even the dress the boy wore at that time. For a very long time he has been out of his native village. He seldom goes to Hathori now)

At the time of happening of this incident I was 14 or 15 years old and was a student of the local school of Hathori. I heard the rumour that Hurbux a brahman of Hathori was reborn in Salimpur village. My elder brother Bhagwat Singh reported the news to the Maharaja. Being interested in such cases, the Maharaja called the boy at Bharatpur. The boy went to Bharatpur with his father. The Maharaja interviewed the boy and ordered Tehsildar Ram Swaroop (Tehsildar of Weir) to take the boy to Hathori. It was evening when the boy was brought to Hathori. I was standing at the foot of the fortress. The boy came in bullockcart. He was wearing a shining cap, new trousers and coat. With him was a State official, who, I later came to know, was the Tehsildar of Weir. They got down from the cart and went towards the street in which some prominent persons of the village were living. I did not care the matter and went to my house. Next morning, I saw that the Tehsildar asked the boy to lead to his previous house and all other persons were asked to follow him. The boy reached straight to his house and said—"This is my house, my bullocks were tied here and buffaloes in that corner." After this the Tehsildar allowed the villagers to ask questions to the boy. The villagers asked the boy whether he had any issue in his previous life. Prabhu replied that he had two sons and two daughters. He named the elder son Ghure and Natthu the younger one. I don't remember the names of his daughters. Shri Govind (a partner of Hurbux) asked the boy "If you are Hurbux then tell me whether you had any quarrel with any body." Prabhu replied "Yes, I had quarrel with you and while quarrelling you pushed me into the Kankarwala well." Prabhu also said about the buried money at the stable in his house and indicated three wells also e.g., Kankarwala, Paniharinwala and Musariawala. After this the boy was taken back to Bharatpur.

Q. Were you present in Bharatpur when the Maharaja called the boy ?

A No.

Q. Who was the Tehsildar of Weir ?

A. Chowdhari Ram Swaroop.

Q Did he take the boy to Hathori or somebody else ?

A He took the boy to Hathori.

Q Is Pandit Nathi *Mandir-wala* son of Hurbux ?

A. Yes.

Q. Was there any quarrel between Hurbux and Shri , Govind ? If so, on what ground ?

A. Yes, they had a quarrel about a tamarind tree in Hathori.

Q. Did Prabhu point out the exact amount of money buried under the ground ?

A Yes But I do not remember how much money he pointed out.

Q Describe how recognition test was given to Prabhu ?

A. Prabhu was left free to lead the way to the house of Hurbux He was going ahead of the crowd that followed him. With confidence he was moving forward Though the road is divided into two narrow roads at the house of Mangi Lal, yet the boy did not confuse the route and straightway reached the house of Hurbux which was in ruins and pointed towards the same.

(English translation of the article by Dr. Rao Bihadur Shyam Sunderlal published in "Revue Metapsychique" (July-August, No 4, 1921, pages 302-307) translated from the French by (Mrs) Gudrun Gunther, Lecturer in French Language, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur.)

Apparent Cases of Memories of Past Lives

The Indian revue KALPAKA has recently published the result of an investigation into some cases of alleged memories of previous lives, cases observed in young children. The investigation, ordered by H H the Maharaja of Bharatpur, was assigned to the charge of Dr Rao Bihadur Shyam Sunderlal, C I E, and it was carried out with a perfectly scientific bent of mind

We publish to-day the report of Dr Rao Bihadur without any comment. I intend to discuss these facts and their significance in a forthcoming article on "The Idea of Reincarnation"

Dr. G. Geley
Director.

1 Case of the Child "Prabhu".

I was informed about the case of this child by H H the Maharaja of Bharatpur in the month of August 1922 His name is Prabhu (Brahmin), he is the son of Kharati (Brahmin), from Sahmpur (in the State of Bharatpur), and at the time of our inquiries he was 4 years, 7 months and 18 days old

As soon as he learnt speaking, "Prabhu" began to tell his father the alleged memories of a former life The inquiry into the matter comprises two phases

In the first, the child was examined at the house of his father, in the month of March 1923, by the Naib Tehsildar.

In the second, the child was, on my request, taken for the purpose of verification, to Hathori, the village where he claimed to have lived in his previous life. The Tehsildar of Weir himself took him there, and immediately called together the four most important leading persons of the village. (the child and the Tehsildar arrived at night and the leading persons were brought face to face with the child at the first hour of the following morning)

The child was questioned in their presence

Here follow face to face the statements which the child gave at the house of his father or later in presence of the notables of Hathori, and the verified information about these statements ;

303. *Statements of the child* *Verification of the statements.*

(A) At the house of his father.

1. I was, in my previous life Hurbux, brahmin, of the village Hathori, in Bharatpur District It is correct, that a man named Hurbux, son of Muhde, had lived in Hathori and had died 5 years ago.

2 I had two sons, Ghure and Shyam Lal, and two daughters, Kokila and Bhola, one of them married Ramhet of Kherli, the other one Gokal of Navar. I had accepted some money for the marriage of the first one, All these details were perfectly correct.

-
- 1) The leading persons are 1 Dharam Singh Foudar, 60 years old, 2 Foudar Azmat Singh, Lumbardar of the village, 50 years old 3 Foudar Sam Singh, 73 years old, 4. Harknath Brahman, 40 years old

but I had given the hand
of the second without
any financial indemnifi-
cation

3 I had a habitation at Hathori. Correct

4 The house of Swarupa Jat was next to mine Correct

5 Swarupa Jat had a son and a daughter Correct

6 There was an elevated path paved with stones Correct

7 There was a tank in the middle of which there was a house, and above the tank there was a Chhatra (Cenotaph with a dome) Correct in all the details

8 There were two houses one above the other in the tank. Correct

9. Hathori had some wells with drinking water

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) Panhariwala, shaded by two holy fig-trees | The Panhariwala well is indeed shaded by holy fig-trees |
| b) Kankarwala, shaded by plum-trees | The Kankarwala well is dry and was already dry at the time of Hurbux The plum-trees, which gave shade to it have disappeared, there is only a fig-tree left The Mooliwala well is unknown There is a well called Jhasroyawala, shaded by a mango-tree and fig-tree |
| c) Mooliwala, shaded by mango trees | |

10. I had a Gujar of the village Bhore as *Yayman*. This allegation could not be checked.

11. There is an inscription inside a fortress, where there is a snake. In the fortress there is neither inscription nor snake, but this was a wide spread legend in the village. Hurbux must have believed in it as his fellow villagers did.

12. In the year of the famine (Samvat, 1934) Correct.

I was staying in Hathori and I had a pair of buffaloes with which I cultivated my fields.

13. I died, when my father was still alive, in a bungalow outside the village. Incorrect Hurbux died in his village-house after the death of his father.

14. After my death I lived in the spiritual world (the world of God).

304 15 Childlike fantasy of the divinity.

16 God told me to go to Salampur (the place of my present birth).

17. The name of my wife was Ganjo (that means bald-headed) The name of his wife was Gauron, but she had got nickname Ganjo, because she was partly bald-headed.

18 My father's name was Mudhe Correct

19. My maternal uncle lived at Bugaon Correct

20 My father-in-law lived at Borhwar. Correct

21 Moola jat fell into This fact could not be checked.
my well and I managed Nobody in the village re-
to pull him out safe and membered it.
sound

The Tehsildar remarks that the child, while being inter-
rogated, sometimes started smiling and talking like a baby

*(B) Statement given at Verification of the statements.
Hathori in the presence
of the leading men of the
village*

The child confirmed all
the former statements
and added some new,
which follow here

1 He had three brothers

1 Gilla, who was alive Hurbux had only one brother,
at the moment of his Shcobux But Chunni and
(Hurbux) death Gilla were his cousins (sons of
his uncle Bhola) Chnnni had

2 Ghunni, died before indeed died before Hurbux.
he did

3 He could not re- It was not possible to get any
member the name of the confirmation of this story.
third brother One day
he had come across a
snake in the jungle, he
had hypnotized it and
then knocked it dead
against a tree

He was Purohit of the Correct The son of Hurbux
village of Bh is still priest in the temple of
this village

He declared that he did
not remember the names
of the members of his

family other than he had pointed out. As to his existence in the hereafter, he said that he did not remember it

When the inquiry had been concluded, the child was asked to find out his former dwelling-place. He started walking, went a few steps, then stopped, hesitating. The Tehsildar now took his hand. The child, after some time started again. Hesitating for a while, he finally went by himself up to his former home and touched the finger of "his son" Ghure. The way to get there was long and circuitous, but the child was able to reach the goal in spite of that. The houses were in ruins, reaching the place, where the front-door of his own house was, he stopped, uncertain, and could not make out exactly his dwelling amidst the remains lying there accumulated.

The child did not recognize any of the persons of Hathori, whom he had met so-to-say in his former life, and he could not remember the names of the others, except those mentioned above.

The Naib Tehsildar adds, in conclusion, that in his opinion, the child has not been instructed by anybody about these things and that his case is an authentic one of recall of a past life

Consequently, following the advice of the honourable C C Watson, accredited Agent to the Governor General of Rajasthan, effort was made to gather more testimony and to make sure that there had not been any previous instruction to the child. Measures were, therefore, taken to question thoroughly the father of the little boy, to come to know how the latter had first remembered his former life and whether somebody of Sahimpur had any acquaintance with Hathori

Here is the testimony of Khairati, father of the child, as it was taken by the Tehsildar of Weir (Rajputana), thanks to the courtesy of H.H. the Maharaja of Bharatpur.

Testimony of Khairati, father of the child "Prabhu" of Salimpur, Parganah Weir, State of Bharatpur, taken up by Ram Singh, Naib Tehsildar

1 "The horoscope of Prabhu was drawn up at his birth, I shall send it as noon as I am back home

2 It was to me that Prabhu spoke first of his last incarnation. One day, all of a sudden he called out that his dear little sons were in a very bad situation and that he would carry them home on his shoulders. He repeated this several times, and when I asked him who his sons were and where they were staying, and why he talked nonsense, he kept silence.

Later on, when he was sitting near his mother, who was churning butter, he said that she was extremely stingy with butter towards him, whereas his former mother made him sit near the churn and gave him big pieces of it. His mother asked him, where his former mother was. He replied that she was in Hathori, that his own real name was Hurbux, and that he ought to be called that and not Prabhu.

Another time, at midnight, when he was sleeping at his mother's side, he shuddered and cried 'Oh my Rama, my children are in a bad situation. He was told by now to talk about his previous incarnation, and he did so in telling the facts already repeated to the Naib Tehsildar, and the news spread in the whole village.

I have never been to Hathori and I had no relation there. Moreover nobody in the village has any relation there, not even the least contact with it.

3 I am the father of Prabhu. The story of his former incarnation was first told by him to me and to my wife. Then others heard it. The horoscope could be drawn which shows that my son was born in the night of Mah Sudi 2nd Sambat 1975, and that he is 4 years 7 months and 18 days old."

EVIDENCES FOR REINCARNATION*

By : PROF ERNEST WOOD

Very close to my own experience, was one which abounded in circumstantial evidence of its accuracy. This was the case of a Hindu boy four years old remembering his previous incarnation, with many places and names and other things specifically stated.

It was told to me by a very close friend of mine, in whose house I had the pleasure of staying a number of times. This was Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal, C I E., Prime Minister of the large State of Gwalior in the north of Central India.

There was a four year old boy named Prabhu who was the son of a man of brahman caste whose name was Khairati. In the course of his play this boy began talking about other people in a very curious manner, giving very exact statements about what he called his previous life. In the course of this he told his name and the year of his birth, and gave a description of himself and of various incidents such as famine which occurred. He spoke also of it when he grew up to be a man. He gave the names of his wife and daughters and sons, and even stated how much money he had received in connection with the marriage of his children. In addition, he described what his home was like, where it was and also some of the relatives and neighbours.

Shyam Sunder Lal—a man of great probity and responsibility—supervised an inquiry into the truth of these statements, the results of which were set down by one of the state officials as follows

*Lecture by Prof Ernest Wood published in *ANCIENT WISDOM*
V XXII, No 7, Sept, 1956

1. In my past life I was Hurbux Brahman of the village of Hathori in Bharatpur.

2 I had two sons, Ghure and Shyam Lal, and two daughters, Kokila and Bholi, who were married respectively to Rahmet of Kherli and Gokul of Navar. I had taken some money in consideration for the Marriage of the former, but gave away the latter without any money

3 I had home at Hathori

4 There was Swarupa Jat's house adjoining mine.

5 Swarupa Jat had a son and a daughter

6 There was a raised pathway paved with stones leading to my house

7. There was a pukha tank and in it a building and over the tank there was domed cenotaph.

8 There were two houses to the tank, one over the other.

9 In Hathori there were drinking water wells as follows :

(a) Panhariwala, which had two pipal trees

(b) Kankarwala, which had plum trees.

(c) Mooliwala, which had mango trees

10 I had as my *yajman* a man named Gujar of the village of Bhore

11 There is an inscription, a fortress, in which there is a serpent

12 In the famine year of Sambat 1934 I was in my village of Hathori and I had a pair of bullocks with which I cultivated my fields

13 I died in my father's lifetime in a bungalow outside my village.

14 After my death I lived in the spiritual world

15 God had moustache and beard

16 God told me to go to Salimpur (His present place of birth)

17 My wife's name was Ganjo (which means bald-headed)

- 18 My father's name was Munde
19. My maternal uncle was in Bargawan.
- 20 My father-in-law was in Burhiwan
- 21 Moola Jat once fell into my well and I managed to bring him out alive, saving his life

In an effort to verify these statements the child was taken to the village of Hathori which he described, the Naib Tehsildar making the trip with him in a car drawn by bullock. Under the direction of the Maharaja of Bharatpur the official summoned the oldest and the most respected citizens and with him they checked up the accuracy of the details given by the child as follows —

1. His name in his supposed former life and that of his father were found to be the names of a father and son who had lived there at the time he had mentioned and who had died as he had said

- 2 Of the three brothers he said, he had only one was found, but the names of the other two were found to be the names of first cousins and one of these predeceased him as he had said

3. The details as to his two sons and his two daughters were found to be correct in every detail, even to one son lying before him and as to the money paid on the marriage of only one of the daughters

- 4 The name of the neighbour he had mentioned and also the details concerning his children were found to be as stated His account of the paved walk was correct.

- 5 His statement concerning the wells was also found to be correct, except that he was confused as to the kind of trees at one of them

- 6 His assertion that he had died in a cottage outside of the village was wrong, it being learned that the person he was supposed to be had died in his own home in the village and after his father's death

7 The exact year of the birth of the person he was supposed to have been could not be ascertained. It was said that he died at the age of 55 in the Sambat year 1962

8 His statements concerning the maternal uncle and the name of the other village were found to be correct.

9 His having cultivated his field with a pair of bullock in the year of the famine was also found to be correct.

10 His statements concerning his grandfather and his father-in-law were also found to be as he had said, but he could not give the names of these families

11 It was found that the real name of the wife of the man he was supposed to have been was Gaura, but that as she was slightly bald-headed she had been nick-named Ganjo (bald-headed), which makes his statement all the more remarkable

12 His statement that Moola Jat had been rescued by him from a well could not be verified and nobody of that name could be re-called

13 His statement about a big tank and a building in it was found to be correct. The building is of three storeys, two of which are under water. The child was led to the tank and recognised it as the one to which he referred

14 A statement, made later, that he was a purohit was found to be correct, and his supposed son is to this day a priest in the village

15 An examination of the Fortress of Hathori revealed an inscription with a serpent in it

16 He could not repeat statements about his post-mortem existence, nor about God having a great beard but he did say that in his previous existence he himself had such a beard and this was found to be so

17 The child was then asked to find his way to his supposed former home in the village. He advanced some steps and then hesitated. He was led part of the way by the official and then after slight hesitation took the right route and went direct to the house. It is added that the way was long and confusing. On reaching the site of the house he was confused as it was now in ruins and he could not tell which had been his from the others in the same block.

18. The child could not recognise any of the people of the village, and could not recall the names of any excepting those he had previously mentioned.

My friend was so deeply impressed by this occurrence and the fact that the child could not have derived these ideas from his playmates or other people that he had the case written out and sent to various newspapers. One account of it appeared in the *New York Times* of September 16, 1923.

It will be noticed in the case of this Hindu boy, as in that of Bridey Murphy, there is a statement that after death there was some life in a disembodied condition or another sort of world. That the boy said he saw God there, with a moustache and beard, is quite in keeping with the rest of the story, for he might easily have simple-mindedly regarded some one of superior attainments in that condition as God.

MEMORY OF PAST LIFE RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

I beg to announce that steps have been taken to form the Memory of Past Life Research Association. Rno Bahadur Shyam Sunder Lal, C I E, Chief Minister, Alwar is the head of the Association and on the request of some men, I have undertaken to organise it. A number of applications for membership have been received and dealt with individually, but I would take liberty to impress upon the aspirants to keep this Association purely a society of seekers after truth. No tinge of sentimental or emotional element should be allowed to enter. All the enthusiasm of a researcher without the emotions of a preacher is wanted. So far communications have been received from the U P. only with the exception of one from Calcutta, one from Ajmere, one from Simla and one from the C P.

Steps are being taken to communicate to other provinces as well the news of the formation of the Association. Correspondents are welcome to write to facilitate the work. The idea is that in the case of Madras Presidency in each division, a thoroughly reliable representative of the Association be found, besides any number of other members interested in the subject. Details of working would be settled after the registration of members in consultation with them.

Known past cases of Memory of Previous birth will shortly be published in the form of a pamphlet with all the wealth of reliable details available. The Association which is still only in the course of formation, cannot of course vouch for the authenticity of these cases, but only such cases would be published in this pamphlet as would be believed by it to be true and to have been investigated on unbiassed lines. I shall be obliged if those who are in possession of facts regarding such cases would communicate them to me with all the details, including names of persons who can vouch for the truth of the facts under report.

It is intended that the cases that the Association should in future publish after its enquiry be based on no less reliable evidence than what a High Court requires to sentence a man to death. I saw a query in the columns of the *Leader* by a correspondent as to why such cases occur in Hindu families only. This query is based on a presumption. It would be more correct to put why such cases are reported by Hindu families only. The reason is simple, but some cases have been brought to light in European and American countries and I am trying to get at their accounts. Another correspondent has quoted a verse from Sufism to prove that the theory of re-birth is believed there too

It is not our object to prove to the world what religions or sects preach re-birth and what do not. Our only object is to investigate reported cases of memory of Previous Birth and let the public know the bare facts as they come to light on inquiry

The Secretary of Radha Swami Sat Sang has very kindly offered the Association a Home in the Sangat's spacious Dayal Bagh at Agra. Other highly influential bodies are equally interested. The offer of the Sat Sang is greatly to be appreciated. It would be availed of when opportunity arises, but at the present stage, it would be in the interests of the Association, not to too closely associate itself in any way with any religious institution. While all the believers in re-birth and *Karma* are most welcome to help and co-operate, personally I would still more welcome those, who do not believe in these theories to join, because their co-operation would be of incalculable value in having the investigation conducted through the severest of tests. I beg all persons of good social position and status who are interested in the work to kindly send in their names for work in their own division or district and to make helpful suggestions.

Before directions for investigation are ready for circulation among members, a note of caution might be sounded lest a prospective case be spoilt for want of experience. No taxing question should be allowed to be put to the child who is

narrating the experience of his past life. Free scope should be allowed to him to narrate all that he remembers and then such questions as are within the grasp of a child-mind, should be put to him. In one case a child was asked if he had seen God and if God had a beard. This puzzled the child.

Ram Gopal Misra

MEMORY-OF-PAST-LIFE RESEARCH ASSOCIATION.

PROCEDURE IN INVESTIGATION

(Published by Pandit Ram Gopal Mishra, B.Sc., M.R.A.S.,
P C.S., Oris, U P, India)

1. As soon as a member receives news of a case of the memory of previous birth in his district he should send an intimation to the secretary and proceed to the scene. If the case be of another district and the member be disinclined to go there he should only send intimation to the secretary—preferably by wire—and the secretary shall arrange to send an investigator to the spot without delay

- 2 (a) In conducting the enquiry respectable persons of the locality should be taken in company.
- (b) The child should be examined only when he is quite at his ease and is cheerful and undistracted
- (c) No attempt should be made to confuse the child of perfect *shanti* (peace).
- (d) Every encouragement should be given to obtain a detailed and connected narrative
- (e) In case of an obvious discrepancy questions may be put to have the mistakes corrected, a record however must be made of the fact

3 After the story has been taken down an attempt should be made to ascertain if the child has not been unconsciously influenced by a strong mental emotion or thought of the parents, particularly of the mother about the time or during pregnancy.

Explanation :—

- (a) Attachment to some relation or friend who dies, often causes such sorrow that the bereaved is consoled

only on dreaming that the deceased is reborn in the family

- (b) Sight of a corpse, a funeral, or the story of a ghastly death or a ghost effects the temperament of some Ladies Such a story may react on the system of the mother and produce some effect on the child in the womb or might be repeatedly overheard by child in infancy in the conversation of the parents or in the family circle and sometimes it may be impressed on the child's mind

4 Children often like to identify themselves with others and some, in order to claim the honour of being the head of the house, express the desire to be addressed with his official designation Such a child on hearing from any relation, visitor or neighbour of a story regarding some life may take the fancy of identifying himself or herself with the deceased The possibility of hearing any account of the kind must be investigated

5 Questions must be put to the child or others, if necessary, to ascertain the time when and the circumstances under which the child gave the account for the first time and to find out who were present on the occasion and whether it was a purely domestic circle or some outsiders were also present on the occasion In the former case the interval between the private and a public account should be noted The evidence of those who heard the account early should be obtained wherever possible to see if there have been any minor or important changes in the details, and whether the story has been developed from some stray remark of the child

6 A verification of the accounts will be necessary if from the preliminary enquiries indicated above the case seemed to be authentic The relations and guardians of the child should be impressed with the necessity of the enquiry being a very careful one in order to place the evidence thus obtained on a scientific basis

7. When external circumstances have been dealt with the mentality of the child should be tested.

The object of the test will be to find out if :—

- (a) The child is psychic.
- (b) Has a tendency to be prophetic.
- (c) His attempts to describe past or future events are usually correct or not.

A detailed account of the story and its verification and a summary of other incidental questions with the views of the investigator regarding the case as authentic or otherwise would be prepared and submitted to the Secretary of the Society. Signature of respectable persons present should be taken on the memorandum of facts of the case.

8 No member should send the details of the account to the Press but may send, if he so likes, a lean outline of the case for publication in papers with a note that the M.P.L. Research Association is investigating the case.

9. Slight modification of the methods according to the needs of the case is allowed, but the aim should always be to investigate explicitly with the object of discovering the truth.

10 Indians are generally reluctant to give out that their child has remembrance of past life, they consider it in-auspicious and sometimes they resent the enquiries. In such a case the parents or guardians should be told that there is no ulterior or sophical object in view beyond a philosophical enquiry.

11. If the scene of the reported previous life is in the vicinity, at the earliest convenience the investigator should proceed to the locality with some respectable men and the child.

12. Persons concerned should be approached and questioned coolly on the points stated by the child.

13. The child should be asked to identify whatever he can, in the presence of respectable men of that place.

- (a) First he should be allowed to make his own identification

(b) Next question should be put to him.

(c) Last photographs and similar other articles should be produced before him to test his memory.

14 The family of previous life and the neighbours should be given a chance then to explain if they can suggest any thing other than the child's memory of previous birth to account for his description and identification.

15 They should be allowed to put questions one by one to the child, but very calmly, and never in the manner as would convey an idea to the child that he is being disbelieved. He should never be allowed to be subject to a volley of questions from a crowd. Any person from the crowd anxious to question and found fit by the investigator to do so, should be separated from the crowd and allowed to question the child mildly.

16 A full account of all that passes should be drawn up on the spot and signed by the respectable persons present. This should be submitted to the secretary of the association with the photograph of the child and of his previous self (if available).

17 If the investigator has not been able to reach the scene of the previous birth the secretary would take immediate steps to depute a person, preferably unassailable, to make investigations and report.

18 The person so deputed would proceed to the home of the child, verify the original report and proceed with the child to the scene of his previous life.

19 The investigator should try to arrange with respectable man of the home of the child who he interested in the work, to keep a note of the subsequent development in the memory of the child and send an abstract of it to the Secretary weekly as long as the memory of the previous birth persists in the child.

20 Points of resemblance and difference in features, habits, likings and dislikings of the child under investigation

and his previous entity should be carefully enquired into and noted.

21. As far as possible photograph of houses and other articles of interest connected with the enquiry should form part of the detailed and clearly drawn up record submitted to the Secretary for publication and any other enquiry, if necessary.

SHYAM SUNDER LAL

(Rao Bahadur, C.I.E.

Chief Minister, Kishangarh)

Head of the Association.

INDEX OF RELEVANT PARTICULARS

A

- 1 *Age .* (of persons figured in the case in approximate years)
 - Salimpur* Brij Mohan (73), Radha Krishna (61), Mangal Ram (55), Vishnu Dutt (23), Kajoralal (50); Dharam Singh (45), Roop Singh (72), Ram Swaroop (55); and Smt Basanti (70)
 - Hathori* Nathulal (84), Pandit Joharilal Sharma (55), Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh (62), and Mangilal (85)
 - Ajhu* Raja Kishan Singh (63)
 - Bharatpur* Chowdhari Rewat Singh (58)
2. *Age of the Subject at First recall* The subject (Prabhu) at the time of his first recall of previous life was approximately one and half years old
- 3 *Ajhu* A village about 22 miles from Bharatpur where Raja Kishan Singh (the witness connected with the case) was interviewed at his residence on November 8, 1964
- 4 *Address* The names of the witnesses and their full addresses have been given under

B

- 1 *Bhusawar* The village Bhusawar lies on the Chonkerwara-Weir route, three

miles from village Salimpur on the one side and thirteen miles from village Hathori on the other. This is a market-place where the people of Salimpur and Hathori often meet on some business. The case of the child Prabhu was much talked about by the people in this village and it is from here that the news reached Hathori.

2. *Behaviour :*

- (1) The behaviour of the Subject with his present relatives, his behaviour with Choudhari Bhagwat Singh and Nathulal at Bharatpur, with Ghure, the elder son of Hurbux who had arrived at Salimpur and when he was in the company of the leading persons and other villagers of Hathori, should have been carefully marked by the previous investigator and clearly stated in his report but the same was not heeded to

Neither could the witnesses tell us in clear words how the Subject behaved with the aforesaid persons. However, Mangal Ram, (P W No. 3) stated that the Subject embraced the son of Hurbux when he visited Salimpur to see him

- (2) Similarly, the testimony of Pandit Joharilal (P. W. No. 10) points to the typical behaviour of the Subject when he was in the company of the people of Hathori.
- (3) Calling Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh a "Chora" (boy) as stated by Ram Swaroop (S. W. No 8) and confirmed

as true by Bhagwat Singh (P.W. No. 11) was the behaviour of the child most appropriate to the identified Petron who used to call Bhagwat Singh "Chura".

3 *Birth*

The testimony of Ram Swaroop (W. No. 8) and the horoscope of Prabhu establish that he was born on Magh Sudi 2, Samvat 1975 (corresponding to Sunday, 2nd February, 1919).

4 *Bharatpur*

We had our camp at Bharatpur for three days (6th to 8th November, 1964) Chowdhari Rewat Singh (a witness connected with the case) was interviewed here at his residence in Mohalla Gopalgarh

5 *Belief*

Persons interviewed at Salimpur and Hathori believed that Prabhu remembered his previous life

C

1 *Confidence*

It was observed that most of the witnesses were not fully confident about what they said as their memories especially of the much older people had become slippery because of the old age. The period that has lapsed between the main events of the case and our reinvestigation of the case now has become too long to keep in the minds of the witness the details of the case still fresh, though they still remember some events. However, in some witnesses we could observe a marked sense of confidence

with which they gave their testimony and furnished certain details pertaining to the case.

Pandit Johari Lal, in particular, recalled the details of the case in such vivid manner and described them with so much confidence that it appeared as if the whole incident had taken place only a few weeks before.

2. *Camp* The camp of the team of investigators during all the three days was at Bharatpur.
3. *'Chabutari'* It is a raised platform just outside the house where the inmates of the house generally sit during day time
4. *Chronological order* Events of a case if described in chronological order, present an organised picture of the case which can be studied in a correct perspective. This is also helpful in verifying the consistency of statements and the dates of the incidents. Efforts were, therefore, made to get information about the case from the witnesses in chronological order but most of them could not give information as desired
5. *Churn-* The Subject remarked when he was sitting near his mother who was churning butter that she was extremely "Stungy" with the butter since his previous mother had him sit beside the Churn and gave him large pieces of butter from it
6. *Chonkerwara* Chonkerwara Bus stand is at the distance of twenty nine miles in the

vest of Bharatpur where there is a turning towards the East which leads to Bhurwar and Weir.

D)

- 1 *Discrepancy .* A number of discrepancies have been observed by us in the statements of the witnesses when they were compared with the contents of the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal. They are about (1) the names of the sons and daughters of the Identified Person, (2) the names of the husbands of his daughters; (3) the names of his brothers; (4) the third well named by the Subject, (5) designations of the officials who went to Salimpur to record the statement of the subject and who went to Hathori with the Subject and (6) the exact amount of money found buried in the stable of the house of the Identified Person
- 2 *Deer* The Subject is said to have told his parents that before taking his birth in their family he was in the form of a deer.
3. *Date* November 6, 1964—Camp at Moti Mahal, Bharatpur
November 6, 1964—Interview Session at Salimpur
November 7, 1964—Interview Session at Hathori.
November 8, 1964—Morning Interview Session at
Bharatpur, Mohalla Gopalgarh
November 8, 1964—Afternoon Interview Session at
Ajhu

4. *Death*

Calculated according to the comments of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal on item No. 1 of the statement of the subject, Hurbux (IP) died in the year 1918 A D. but the exact date of his death could not be obtained from any source despite many efforts aimed at getting the same

E

1. *Emotional
Behaviour*

The Primary witnesses—Mangal Ram and Kajorilal testified that tears rolled down the cheeks of the subject when he saw Ghure, the elder son of the Identified Person in Salimpur for the first time

2 *Exaggeration*

The witnesses while making statements did not seem to have exaggerated the facts of the case. They denied to make any statement about the case which was not in their knowledge and stated only those which they remembered to have either seen for themselves or heard from their relatives or friends. We have noted down our observations about each witness in the Introductory note to his respective statement

3. *Extent of Exchange* : The testimony of the witnesses evinces that there was no exchange of any sort between the two families concerned that of the Subject and that of the Identified Person—prior to the attempt at verification. They testified that they never saw Ghure in their village Salimpur before the incident took place

Similarly, the people of Hathori also testified that there was no exchange between the two parties before the incident. However, they said, a religious discourses used to go to their village occasionally but he was not seen mixing with the family of the Identified Person nor did they ever see the Subject accompanying with his father to their village.

I'

1 *Fabrication*

The statements of the witnesses indicate that this case was not a fabricated one though many discrepancies have been observed to have crept into their statements.

2 *Fraud :*

Contrivance of fraud does not seem to be there though some points of doubt do persist in the minds of the investigators which have been discussed under Discussion. The Naib Tehsildar added, says Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, that the case was an authentic one of recall of a past life and that in his opinion the subject had not been given information about the details of the case by anyone. No one expressed his or her doubt about the fraudulent motive of the party of the Subject.

3 *Fortress*

There is a fortress in Hathori built on the elevated surface of the land. The Subject referred an inscription in this fortress and a snake connected

with it, when he recalled certain items of his past life.

G

1. *Ganga-Guru*

A Brahmin priest who conducts ceremonies by the side of the Ganges, is called Ganga-Guru. The Ganga-Gurus maintain the age-old records of the geneology of their Yajmans' families and also keep records about the dates of death of the deceased in the families of their Yajmans. Hurbux's Ganga Guru live at Soron (U. P.). They were contacted for obtaining the date of death of Hurbux but the same could not be furnished by them.

2. *Gular*

A fruit of the banyan tree. It is said, that the Identified person survived by eating 'Gular' during the famine in Samvat 1934.

H

1. *Haveli*

A house or a building The 'Haveli' and its surrounding houses in Hathori are now completely in ruins. There are heaps of debris; only a few dilapidated walls appear

2 *Hathori* :

The subject claimed that he belonged to Hathori, a village, five miles from Weir. This village is surrounded on all sides by small hills. The population is approximately 700.

I

1. *Identified Person* .

Hurbux is the Identified Person in this case, as Prabhu claimed to iden-

K

1. 'Kalpaka'

The Introduction to the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal published in "REVUE METAPSYCHIQUE" July-August No. 4, 1924 pp. 302-307 mentions the name of a Hindi magazine "KALPAKA" in which the results of the investigation of the case were previously published. On inquiries we came to know that no magazine named 'Kalpaka' was existent in 1922-23 when the results of the investigation were published. However, the Hindi magazine '*Kalpa-Briksh*' was published from Ujjain and it is still being published from the same place but the findings of the investigation supervised by Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, were not published in any of its issues during the year 1922 to 1924. Later on Shri Ram Gopal Mishra, Secy. of the memory of Past Life Research Associate, confirmed that the said report was published in "*Kalpaka*" and be also supplied at the present address where it is being published. The Editor, '*Kalpaka*' magazine, Tinnevely, South India has been requested to send us a copy of the required issue of the magazine.

M

1. Memories of the witnesses :

Most of the witnesses interviewed in this case seemed forgetful of the details of the case. However they tried to recollect events as best as they could

P

1. *Primary Witness*. Primary witness (P. W.) is a person who saw or observed the subject's recognising items associated with IP's life or observed emotional or other behavioural reactions of S
2. '*Purohit*' A Brahmin priest who conducts ceremonies at the house of his *Yajmans* is known as the *Purohit*.

R

1. *Recalls* The subject recalled that—(1) his name was Hurbux, (2) his village Hathori, (3) he had two sons and two daughters, (4) one of his daughter was married at Kherli and the other at Navar; (5) he accepted money for the marriage of one of his daughters, (6) he had a house at Hathori, (7) The house of Swaroop Jat was next to his house, (8) Swaroop Jat had a son and a daughter, (9) there was a raised path paved with stones there; (10) there was a tank in the middle of which there was a "*Chhatra*" (domed Cenotaph), (11) there were two houses—one on the top of the other in the tank, (12) Hathori had three water wells for drinking—(a) Panihariwala—shaded by two holy fig trees, (b) Kankarwala—shaded by plum tree and (c) Mooliwala—shaded by Mango tree, (13) he had a Gujar of the village Bhole as *Yajman*, (14) there was an inscription in a fortress at Hathori where there was a snake, (15) in the year of the

famine (Samvat 1934) he lived at Hathori and he had a pair of buffaloes with which he ploughed his fields; (16) he died during his father's life time in a bungalow outside the village, (17) the name of his wife was Ganjo (which means 'hald'); (18) his father's name was Mudhe, (19) his father-in-law lived at Burhwari, (20) his maternal uncle lived at Bugaon; (21) he had three brothers—1. Gilla, 2. Ghunni and 3 a third whose name he could not remember; (22) Moola Jat had fallen into his well and he saved his life; (23) his mother used to give him large pieces of butter; and (24) he had a long heard which caught fire when he was performing the ritual of 'Holi' burning

2. *Recognition*

The subject is stated to have recognised the following items associated with his supposed previous personality.—

(1) IP's son Ghure; (2) Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh of Hathori; (3) Nathi Lal, the nephew of IP; (4) Dharam Singh Foujdar, (5) Azmet Singh; (6) Foujdar Swaroop Singh; (7) Harkanth Brahmin, (8) Rampal Jat, (9) Sampat, the grocer, (10) house of Rampal Jat, (11) house of IP, (12) Srigovind, (13) Shiv Naram, (14) the place where IP had buried money; (15) the path leading to the house of IP, and (16) the tamarind tree at Hathori

3. *"Revue Metapsychique"*

The report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal entitled, "Apparent

cases of memories of Past Lives" was published in the July-August, No 4 1924 issue of the French periodical "Revue Metapsychique".

- 4 *Route* The routes to the village figured in this case have been described under "Relevant Facts of Geography" (page)
- 5 "*Rukmani Mangal*" A legendary tale

S

- 1 *Salampur* The subject belonged to this village. It is a small village having the population of about 1200 persons. It lies off the main road from Chonkarwara Bus Stand to Weir via Bharatpur.
2. *Secondary witness* Secondary witness is he or she who reports the events of the case as he or she has heard from others
3. *Subject* Prabhu, son of Khairati of village Salampur is the Subject in this case
- 4 *Source of Information* The source of information about the case in the present study is the English translation by (Mrs) Gudrum Gunther, Lecturer in French Language, University of Rajatshan, India, of the report of Dr Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal, published in French in the July-August, No 4, 1924 issue of "Revue Metapsychique"

T

1. *Tamarind Tree* The subject is said to have recognised the tamarind tree near the house of IP which was in dispute between the IP and Sri Govind, his neighbour

2. *Tank* . The details given by the Subject about the tank in the village of Hathori, were verified by us on the spot and found to be correct.
3. *Team* . The teams of investigators in the present case consists of—H.N.B., P.K.M and S.C.M.
4. *Testimony* : Observations of the present investigators in this case are based on the testimony of the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal and that of the witnesses interviewed by them at their place of residence
5. *Time spent on each witness* : The interview with each witness lasted for about 20 to 25 minutes. Primary witnesses were, however, given much time.
6. *Tape-recording* The statement of Ram Swaroop (W. No 8) recorded at Bhusawar on December 25, 1964 was tape-recorded

V

1. *Village* The villages figured in the present study of the case are—Salimpur, Hathori, Ajhu besides the city of Bharatpur.

W

1. *Wells* . The subject recalled the names of three water wells in Hathori—(1) Punhariwala; (2) Kankarwala and (3) Mooliwala. On verification, the number of wells was found to be correct but the name of the last one

does not find corroboration in the testimony of the witnesses as against that of the report of Dr. Rao Bahadur Shyam Sunderlal

2 *Witnesses*

(a) Salimpur (P.O. Salimpur, District Bharatpur)

- 1 Brij Lal S/o Pancha—villager
- 2 Radha Krishna S/o Durga—nephew of S
3. Mangal Ram Sharma S/o Girdhari—nephew of S and cousin of Brij Lal
- 4 Vishnu Dutt Sharma S/o Ram Swaroop Sharma—nephew of S
- 5 Kajori Lal Sharma s/o Ram-Kumar, a villager
- 6 Dharam Singh s/o Sonpal—a friend of S
- 7 Roop Singh s/o Ghenda Ram—a neighbour
- 8 Rom Swaroop s/o Khairati—elder brother of S.
9. Smt Basanti d/o Chiranjit—not related to the family of S

(b) Hathori (P O Hathori, District Bharatpur) —

- 10 Pandit Johari Lal Sharma s/o Ramet Lal Sharma—a villager
- 11 Chowdhari Bhagwat Singh s/o Capt Kanchan Singh—formerly A D C. to the Maharaja of Bharatpur State
- 12 Nathi Lal s/o Galla Ram—nephew of X IP

13. Mangi Lal s/o Hulesi Ram—a neighbour.

(c) Ajhu (P.O. Ajhu, Distt. Bharatpur)

14. Raja Kishan Singh s/o Bhoori-Singh formerly Chief of the Staff of the Maharaja of Bharatpur State.

(d) Bharatpur

15. Chowdhari Rewat Singh s/o Capt. Kunchan Singh, Booking Clerk, Transport Bus Service, Mohallah Gopal-Garh.

(c) Soron (Distt Etah, U P)

16. Uma Shanker, son-in-law of Shiv-Shanker Lapsia—Mohalla Chowdharian in front of Narsinghji's Temple, P O. Soron

- 17 Shiv Kumar Dube Hazara, son-in-law of Shiv Shanker Lapsia, Mohalla Chowdharian—in front of Narsinghji's Temple, P O. Soron

(f) Hindaun (Distt Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan) —

18. Shankerlal Jaga—in front of Hospital, Pan-ki-Dukan, P. O. Hindaun.